

THE  
METHODIST QUARTERLY REVIEW.

APRIL, 1842.

---

EDITED BY GEORGE PECK, D. D.

---

- ART. I.—1. *Introduction to the History of Philosophy*. By VICTOR COUSIN, Professor of Philosophy of the Faculty of Literature at Paris. Translated from the French, by H. G. LINBERG. 8vo., pp. 458. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, & Co. 1832.
2. *Elements of Psychology, included in a Critical Examination of Locke's Essay on the Human Understanding, being a Translation from the French of ten Lectures of Volume II. of Cousin's History of Philosophy in the Eighteenth Century*. Translated from the French, with an Introduction and Notes. By the Rev. C. S. HENRY, D. D. Second edition, prepared for the use of Colleges. 12mo., pp. 423. New-York: Gould & Newman. 1838.
3. *Philosophical Miscellanies; translated from the French of Cousin, Jouffroy, and B. Constant, with Introductory and Critical Notices*. By GEORGE RIPLEY. Contained in Vols. I. and II. of *Specimens of Foreign Standard Literature*. 12mo., pp. 383, 376. Boston: Hilliard, Gray, & Co. 1838.

THE philosophical writings of Cousin have for several years been rapidly gaining favor in this country; but the public mind seems not yet to have decided upon their merits, nor determined what rank to assign them among the productions of the master spirits in philosophy. We are not surprised at this tardiness, when we reflect with what suspicion every metaphysical system, originating in France, is received on this side of the Atlantic.

It is undoubtedly true that the opinions of Cousin are not to be received without due allowance for French enthusiasm and French prejudices. Allowance is to be made, too, for the peculiar forms of expression and style of thought, incident to the views of the French upon morals and theology; nor should we forget the mysticism in which papal superstition has shrouded the pure and sublime truths of Christianity. And, indeed, after we have made

all the allowance that philosophical candor would require, we may find opinions expressed by him to which we cannot subscribe. Some things, too, we may find vaguely expressed. But these, though they may subject him to severe, and, in some instances, to deserved criticism, will by no means justify that wholesale butchery of his philosophy, in which certain sanguinary critics seem to glory. They are only the excrescences which an exuberant and fertile genius, incessantly goaded to action by a determined spirit, will here and there shoot out. Apply to these the pruning knife, lop them carefully from the main trunk; and much that is really grand and beautiful will remain. But some can see nothing but the deformities, the excrescences of Cousin's philosophy; upon these they "lay too might and main," and after rendering themselves ridiculous by an exhibition of their ignorance of what they would fain oppose, they arrogate to themselves the honor of giving him a signal overthrow. A closer inspection, however, might have shown them, that while the true elements of his philosophy remained untouched, they have wasted their energies in demolishing a spectre, conjured up by their own shallow divinations.

In writing a former article on this subject, we expressed some of the convictions which had arisen in our own mind from an attentive perusal of Cousin's works; without reference to the views that were entertained by others respecting them. Indeed, we had devoted but little attention to the criticisms with which almost every review in the country has teemed. We found too much satisfaction in the general scope of his metaphysical discussions, and in the frank, and, in general, the clear elucidation of his principles, to feel much solicitude in knowing what flaws "penny worth of criticism might beetle in the edges of his philosophy." Since then, however, our attention has been called to some of these specimens of criticism; and we must confess our surprise at the manifest injustice that is done to the French philosopher, whatever may be his faults; and the assiduity with which some seek to fasten upon him opinions which he has nowhere avowed, and which are deducible by no fair criticism from the general tenor of his works. It will be our object in the present article to consider some of these points of attack, and the "far-fetched" criticism by which it is endeavored to bring odium upon a work whose wide circulation, we have no doubt, would have an influence to excite philosophical inquiry, and thereby greatly subserve the cause of truth; but we shall not hesitate to apply the pruning knife, for we are smitten with no "*lues Boswellina*," wherever it may be required.



In our former article, to which we have already alluded, we confined ourselves mainly to the criticism upon the system of Locke. It had been our original plan, after noticing that criticism, to comment upon some of the leading features of Cousin's philosophy; but we soon found that a very hasty review of the criticism upon Locke, and a few remarks upon the eclecticism of Cousin, would require all the space for which we could venture to ask. We shall now return, and undertake to carry out our original plan. It may be well to premise, however, that we shall devote but little, if any, attention to those purely speculative notions which have no direct or assignable bearing upon the moral and religious faith of man. And we hope we shall be able to show that a sound and rational theology has nothing to fear from the prevalence of eclecticism, using the term as it is now applied.

In order to understand the true nature of Cousin's philosophy, it is necessary to consider the state of metaphysical science in France at the time of his appearance; what were the prevailing systems; and what the systems which he combated. Much of the vagueness which exists in the minds of those who have with any attention studied the doctrines of Cousin, has resulted from inattention to these data. The school of French philosophy had pushed sensualism to its last result, and become incorrigible supporters of materialism and infidelity. But what is sensualism? It is that system which makes sensation the only principle and source of knowledge. Its fundamental maxim is:—*Nihil est in intellectu, quod non fuit prius in sensu*.\* But what are the logical consequences of sensualism; or what is sensualism pushed out into its last results? In the first place,—All sensation is passive, consequently all its products must be passive. If, then, all the mental phenomena result from sensation, they must be passive, and there can be no such thing as a *free* or *voluntary* action. Thus, one of the logical results of sensualism is *fatalism*. A second result, or logical consequence, is, materialism, which regards the soul, not as a separate principle in our nature, a real existence; but in some sort, as an abstract idea, "which represents, in the last analysis, the diversity of our sensations." Thus the soul is reduced to a mere product of our nervous system. "Sensibility is the property of the nerves; and sensibility explains the moral faculties, the intelligence, the will; in fact, the whole inward nature of man. Man is a moral being, because he is capable of sensation; he is capable of sensation, because he has nerves; the nerves make the

\* Leibnitz has the following modification of this maxim:—"Nempe, nihil est in intellectu, quod non fuerit in sensu, nisi ipse intellectus."

man. The brain secretes thought as the liver secretes bile."\* But it stops not here: having produced fatalism, and annihilated personality, the *me*, the soul; it advances but one step further to negate the divine existence. "As this system regards the soul of man as the result and combination of our sensations, it is also compelled to regard the Deity only as the possible result, the combination, the last generalization of the phenomena of nature. God is a kind of soul of the world, which sustains the same relation to the world, as the soul which is admitted by the sensual philosophy does to the body." "But such a being is not the God of the human race; he is not a God distinct from the world."

Through all these stages had the sensual philosophy of France been pushed, till the whole nation sat down in rank atheism. Such is the system against which Cousin has leveled all his powers of reason and analysis; and against which his whole philosophy wages unreserved and unrelenting war. Would it not then be strange, anomalous, if Cousin himself, after all, is discovered to be nothing more than a disciple of the pantheist school of Germany? If he has intrenched himself in the pantheism of Germany, to batter down the kindred pantheism of France? There is an air of ridiculousness about the very supposition; but we will not pursue the subject here.

We have said that such was the system against which he waged war. It was a system dark, and full of enigmas; but in no feature so dark, so hideous, so revolting, as in its moral character and tendencies.

"*Monstrum horrendum, informe, ingens, cui lumen ademptum.*"

That its main pillars of support have been knocked away, is, to every lover of virtue, every friend of humanity, a cause of gratulation. That it should be succeeded by a system more revolting in its character, or ruinous in its tendency, need not be apprehended.

But what is the system which Cousin purges to popular favor, in the place of the exploded systems of sensualism and infidelity? Is it infidelity remodeled, reconstructed, and placed on a firmer basis? Is it atheism dressed up in a garb more befitting modern philosophy? Has he denounced pantheism in one form, that he may exalt it in another? I look beyond all these questions, and think that I discover some glimmering rays, betokening the dawn of a brighter day to those that have long "sat in darkness," when I hear the champion of this "new philosophy," on all occasions,

\* See Mr. Ripley's remarks of Cabanis's Physical and Moral Relations of Man, in his "Introductory Notice," vol. i, *Spe. For. Lit.*

distinctly, and without reserve, acknowledging and proclaiming "the reality of our instinctive faith in God, in virtue, in the human soul, in the beauty of holiness, and in the immortality of man, and advocating the immutable distinction between right and wrong." These are sublime, glorious truths, and lie at the foundation of all true philosophy; and are in themselves essential elements of the Christian faith. M. Vincent, one of the pastors of the Protestant Church at Nismes, in his work entitled *Views on Protestantism in France*, speaks thus of the eclectic philosophy:\*

"The moment in which I am writing these pages presents an interesting spectacle to the friends of philosophy. After a long interval of repose, during which the philosophical schools which had governed the world of thought for two or three generations have peaceably ended their career, tranquillity has awakened again the spirit of meditation. The mind, repulsed from without, has turned upon itself. Disgusted with affairs, it has gone back to man." "Philosophy, itself, has changed its direction. It is no longer a material philosophy. It has become essentially spiritual and moral." "The introduction of this philosophy into France gave a mortal blow to the philosophy of sensation; and marked the revival of spiritualism among us. The soul held an independent place in that philosophy, as an essentially immaterial and thinking force."—Vol. ii, pp. 223, &c.

"It is evident that religion is inconsistent with every material system, under whatever form it may be presented. Religion is the acknowledgment of a moral order, of a spiritual world, which the eyes cannot see, nor the hands reach; the recognition of a Ruler of this universe, of intelligence, and conscience; the desire to regulate life, in view of this order, of this universe, of this Ruler. What have these ideas in common with corpuscles, organs of secretion, or transformed sensations? Religion gains or loses, lives or dies, in the human mind, in proportion as these systems obtain more or less authority. It cannot co-exist with them. If this were not proved by speculation, we might appeal to experience. Wherever the opinions of the materialists have prevailed, religion has receded before them; and within our own notice, we never see them combined within the same mind.

"In this respect, the return of opinion to spiritual systems, the popularity, no less general than unforeseen, of the philosophy taught by M. Royer Collard and M. Cousin, are of immense advantage to religion. They have opened the path for it. They have dissipated the prejudices, without appearing to attack them, which were hostile to its progress. Without professing to be its champions, they have prepared the way for its triumph. They have pointed out in the soul those powers which the senses did not give, and which terminate in religion. They have brought to light, in humanity as a mass, something besides the physical wants which are provided for by industry. They have separated, in some sort, from the chaos of complicated historical fact, a vast spirit of humanity, which directs and animates it in all its mani-

\* Quoted in *Spe. For. Lit.*, vol. i, pp. 238, et seq.

festations ; and this spirit has nothing in common with material interests ; it resembles religion more than any thing else. *The new movement of philosophy is, therefore, as favorable to religion as the preceding was disastrous to it.*—Vol. ii, pp. 237-239.

But how are these truths reached ? Not by overlooking the fact that a large portion of human knowledge is developed through the senses ; (for so far sensualism is founded in truth ;) but also by not forgetting the other sources of knowledge, that the soul opens within itself fountains of thought of equal, if not greater validity and importance. Sensualism overlooked some of the most important elements of knowledge ; but true eclecticism overlooks no source, no element of human thought. All the phenomena of consciousness are brought within its compass and subjected to its scrutiny. In a word, it introduces spiritualism upon the basis of experience ; and thus opens the widest possible field for the most rigid analysis and induction. Its fundamental maxim is, that “after having gained a secure footing in the world of consciousness, we must make a profound and wide-reaching review of all the phenomena which it comprises ; we must be sure that we have omitted no element, that we take no fact for granted, that we do not receive the phantoms of the imagination as the phenomena of consciousness ; we must be sure not only that we have omitted no real element, that we have introduced no foreign element ; but also that we have seen all the real elements under their true aspect, and under all the aspects which they can present.”\* And while, so far as it relates to ontology, the dim lights of sensualism lead us from activity to *nothingness*, from phenomena to no substantial cause ; eclecticism claims that in the phenomena of activity are developed personality, the world, and their cause ; or, in other words, humanity, nature, and God. “Now in point of fact,” says Cousin, “human knowledge embraces both the external world, and the soul, and God.”†

The *me* is revealed to us in the character of force or cause, and that too in every instance, in the very first instance, of activity. Cousin claims that we arrive at the consciousness of *self*, by acting as a cause ; and we act as cause whenever we exercise a volition. Thus the *me* is manifested, personality is revealed ; but it is revealed in its relation to the *not-me*.‡ There is not a single fact of con-

\* Preface to the first edition of the Philosophical Fragments.

† Psychology, p. 200.

‡ The *me*, and the *not-me*, are phrases used to express personality and its opposite, the soul and that which is not the soul, or rather nature. The introduction of these words into our own language, obviates the awkward, and,



consciousness possible without the me ; and, on the other hand, the me cannot know itself without knowing the not-me ; neither the one nor the other can be known with the reciprocal relation which characterises them, without the conception, more or less distinct, of an infinite and absolute Being, to whom they must be referred.

“Reason accordingly arrives at beings as well as phenomena ; it reveals to us the world and God with as much authority as our own existence, or the least of its modifications ; and ontology is no less legitimate than psychology, since psychology, which, by enlightening us as to the nature of reason, conducts us itself to ontology. Ontology is the science of being. It is the knowledge of our own personal existence, that of the external world, and that of God. It is reason which gives us this three-fold knowledge on the same authority with that of the smallest knowledge we possess.”—*Psychology*, pp. 405, 406. Also *Specimens Foreign Literature*, vol. i, pp. 68, 69.

The reasoning of Cousin on this point is so clear and satisfactory that we cannot forbear presenting it somewhat in detail :—

“Can there be a single fact of consciousness without a certain degree of attention ? Let attention be weakened or entirely destroyed, and our thoughts become confused, they are gradually dissipated in obscure reveries, which soon vanish of themselves, and are for us as if they were not. Even the perceptions of the senses are blunted for want of attention ; and degenerate into merely organic impressions. The organ is struck, often, perhaps, with force ; but the mind, being elsewhere, does not receive the impression ; there is no sensation ; there is no consciousness. Attention, therefore, is the condition of all consciousness.

“Now is not every act of attention more or less voluntary ? Is not every voluntary act characterized by the circumstance, that we consider ourselves as the cause of it ? And is it not this cause whose effects vary while it remains the same itself ? Is it not this power which is revealed to us only by its acts, but which is distinguished from its acts, and which its acts do not exhaust ? Is it not, I say, this cause, this force, which we call I, me, our individuality, our personality—that personality of which we never doubt, which we never confound with any other, because we never refer to any other, those voluntary acts which give rise to the inward feeling, the immoveable conviction of its reality ?

“The me, then, is revealed to us in the character of cause, of force. But can this force, this cause which we are, do every thing which it wishes ? Does it meet with no obstacles ? It meets with them of all kinds, at every moment. A sense of our feebleness is constantly united with that of our power. A thousand impressions are at all times made upon us ; take away attention and they do not come to our

sometimes, perplexing circumlocution that, without them, would be necessary to give the true signification of the equivalent phrases in common use in the philosophical language of continental Europe.

consciousness; let attention be applied to them, the phenomena of sensation begins. Here, then, at the same time that I refer the act of attention to myself, as its cause, I cannot, for the same reason, refer to myself the sensation to which attention has been applied; I cannot do this, but I cannot avoid referring it to some cause, to a cause necessarily other than myself, that is to say, to an external cause, and to an external cause whose existence is no less certain to me than my own existence, since the phenomena which suggests it to me is no less certain than the phenomena which suggested my own, and both the phenomena are presented to me with each other."—*Psychology*, pp. 406, 407. Also *Specimens of Foreign Literature*, vol. i, pp. 69, 70.

Here is an explicit admission of the distinct existence of both the soul and the external world; and the ground of our faith in them is laid on the firm basis of the simple perceptions of the human mind. And we may add, that this faith finds firm footing on no other ground. The moment we attempt to change this ground, to hand this faith over to the subtilities of logic; the moment we attempt to prove that which is so perfectly simple, so perfectly rational to the instinctive perceptions of the human mind, that moment we give to truth an up-hill course, while skepticism vaunts itself with favoring wind and tide. It is one of the essential features of the eclectic philosophy that it places these simple, yet indispensable elements of human knowledge, on this firm basis. But we might add, that this is not original with the eclectic philosophy, for eclecticism is undoubtedly indebted for it to Dr. Reid more than to any other person. He clearly apprehended and set forth this principle in his successful effort to stem the downward tendencies of the school of Des Cartes and Locke.

The attempt of Des Cartes to demonstrate the existence of a material world will be recollected, and also the fate of his celebrated argument—*Cogito, ergo sum*—which he considered incontrovertible. The disciples of the Cartesian school felt it incumbent on them to prove the existence of a material world, and this task they repeatedly attempted. The maxim of the master and of the school was, that we ought to admit nothing concerning it but what by just reasoning can be deduced from our sensations. Berkeley demonstrated the utter futility of their arguments; but as the fundamental error of their system did not occur to him, he was left with no middle ground, and rushed into the opposite extreme, denying the existence of the material world.\* His acute

\* It is related of Pyrrho, an ancient skeptic, that he carried his faith in the non-existence of a material world to such a degree of perfection, that if a cart ran against him, or a dog attacked him, or if he came upon a precipice, he would not stir a foot to avoid his danger, pretending to give no credit to his

mind perceived that the same arguments he had made use of to demonstrate the non-existence of a material world, were as valid against the existence of a spiritual world. Yet, it seems not to have lessened his confidence in the legitimacy of his conclusion. The good bishop, perhaps, thought that the material world could be spared without any great disadvantage; but he does not give up the spiritual world so easily, and, to retain it, leaps fairly out of the traces of his own system. He contrives to evade the consequences of his system, rather than contemplate the horrid spectre of universal skepticism. But Hume shrinks not from the utmost consequence. Following in the steps of Berkeley, he first reduced the whole frame of nature, the material universe, to ideas; but this was only the beginning of his work. Thence, he boldly pushed on to the ultimate result of the system, and reduced the soul also to ideas. Here, then, we have both nature and the soul fairly excluded from existence, reduced to ideas; but what is to become of those ideas, where shall they find a "local habitation and a name?" Alas, for them! they are left, "like Epicurus's atoms, to dance about in emptiness."\*

"Des Cartes and Locke take the road that leads to skepticism, without knowing the end of it. They stop short for want of light to carry them further. Berkeley, frightened at the appearance of the dreadful abyss, starts aside and avoids it. But the author of the *Treatise on Human Nature*, more daring and intrepid, without turning aside to the right hand or to the left, like Virgil's Alecto, shoots directly into the gulf:—†

'Hic specus horrendum, et sævi spiracula Ditis,  
Monstrantur, ruptoque ingens Acheronte voraga  
Pestiferas aperit fauces.'‡

senses. He contrived, however, to retain the "mortal coil," in which he had so little faith, till he had numbered his fourscore years and ten. On one occasion, however, to the great scandal of his philosophy, he so far forgot its principles that he got into a great passion with his cook (forgetting that no cook existed) for not roasting his dinner to his mind, and with the spit in his hand, and the meat upon it, pursued him into the market-place. It is from Pyrrho that we have the word Pyrrhonism. See *Diogenes Lærtius*.

\* Dr. Reid thinks it quite humorous in Hume to set out in his introduction, by promising, with a grave face, no less than a complete system of the sciences, upon a foundation entirely new, to wit, that of human nature; when the intention of the whole work is to show that there is neither human nature nor science in the world.—*Reid's Inquiry*, p. 12.

† "No man knew better, or owned more frankly, than Mr. Hume, that to this answer there is no serious reply. Universal skepticism involves a contradiction in terms. *It is a belief that there can be no belief.*"—*Mackintosh on Ethical Philosophy*, p. 220.

‡ "Reid's Inquiry," p. 257. London, 1823. Tegg & Cheapside.



Dr. Reid does not attempt to prove the existence of personality, nor of matter; but assumes their existence as an axiom which cannot be proved, because there are no simpler truths into which these may be resolved—the one being revealed in consciousness, the other in sensation and perception. He rightly affirms that there are distinct and original kinds of evidence, equally grounded on our constitution; none of them depends upon or can be resolved into another. “To reason against any of these kinds of evidence is absurd; nay, to reason for them is absurd. They are first principles; and such fall not within the province of reason, but of common sense.”\*

Many other elements of the eclectic philosophy might be found in the writings of Dr. Reid; but eclecticism has drawn out those ideas and demonstrated their validity in the rigid forms of science. If Condillac adapted the metaphysics of Locke to the latitude of Paris, it is no less certain that Cousin has adapted the philosophy of Reid to the latitude of France.†

“We have then two kinds of distinct causes. The one personal, placed in the very centre of consciousness; the other external, and placed beyond the sphere of consciousness.‡ The cause which we are is evidently limited, imperfect, finite, since it constantly meets with bounds and obstacles among the variety of causes to which we necessarily refer the phenomena that we do not produce; the phenomena purely effective, and not voluntary. On the other hand, these causes themselves are limited and finite, since we resist them to a certain degree as they resist us, we limit their action as they limit ours, and they also continually limit each other. It is reason which reveals to us these two kinds of causes. It is reason, which, developing itself

---

\* Reid's “Inquiry into the Human Mind,” ch. ii, sec. 5.

† This indebtedness is frankly acknowledged by Cousin. “Far from pretending that I have not had masters, I avow that I have had many, both in the past and in the present, both in France and out of France.”—See *Preface to Philosophical Fragments*.

‡ “We must, therefore, be content to embrace the whole system, and admit the existence of mind and matter as ultimate facts, of which we can give no account, (otherwise they would not be ultimate,) and as therefore referable alone to the sovereign will of Him who commanded all things to be as they are. It is sufficient that we know the existence of our own minds by consciousness, and the existence of the external world by perception. Of these two points we are absolutely certain, if there is any certainty in human knowledge; if there is not, it is equally in vain to argue on one side or the other. This seems to be the conclusion to which Hume would wish to reduce us; and it is the conclusion of one who ought to be denounced as the assassin of human happiness. To the authors of all such attempts, the words of Seneca are peculiarly applicable:—‘Non facile dixerim, utrum magis irascor illis, qui nos nihil sciare voluerunt, an illis cui ne hoc quidem nobis reliquerunt, nihil scire.’”—*Edinburgh Encyclopædia*, vol. xxv, article, *Metaphysics*.



in our consciousness, and perceiving there at the same time attention and sensation, as soon as these two simultaneous phenomena are perceived, suggest to us immediately two kinds of distinct causes, but correlative and mutually limited, to which they must be referred. But does reason stop with this? By no means. It is a fact, moreover, as soon as the notion of finite and limited causes is given, we cannot but conceive of a superior Cause, infinite and absolute, which is itself the first and last Cause of all others. The internal and personal cause, and external causes, are incontestibly causes in relation to their own effects; but the same reason which reveals them to us as causes, reveals them as limited and relative causes, and thus prevents us from stopping with them as causes sufficient to themselves, and compels us to refer them to a Supreme Cause, which has made them, and which sustains them, which is in relation to them what they are in relation to the phenomena that are peculiar to them; and which, as it is the Cause of all causes, and the Being of all beings, is sufficient in itself, and sufficient to reason, which seeks and which finds nothing beyond."—*Psychology*, pp. 407, 408. Also *Spe. For. Lit.*, p. 71, et seq.

I have made this long extract, because it presents the fundamental principle of this "new philosophy." At the very starting point, at the very outset, Cousin acknowledges the *substantial* existence of the *me*, or of personality; he as distinctly recognizes the *not-me*, or nature, as distinguished from the *me*, that is, he acknowledges the substantial existence of both spirit and matter. But independent of both, and from both, he distinguishes the *me* absolute, or "the Cause of all causes."\* How perfectly absurd, then, to affirm that he confounds God with nature, when the very first principle, the fundamental element of his philosophy, proclaims their immutable distinction! This is his very starting point, and the watch-word of his philosophy. Schelling started with the principle that God and the universe, knowing and being, were identical, and he was thus led to make God the only Being, and the universe of mind and matter mere modes of his manifestation. But Cousin starts with the opposite principle, and thus is his philosophy, in its fundamental principle, for ever emancipated from any kindredship or alliance with the pantheist philosophy of Germany.†

\* After describing the process by which we arrive to a knowledge of these two existences, the *me* and the *not-me*, the soul and the material universe, Cousin says,—“We are led by similar processes to the Cause of all causes, to the substantial Cause; to God, and not only to a God of power, but to a God of justice, a God of holiness.”—*Preface to Philosophical Fragments*.

† Cousin speaking of Schelling and Hegel, says,—“But while I love to announce the resemblance which connects the philosophy I profess with that of these great masters, I owe it also to truth to avow that I am separated from them by fundamental differences, even in spite of myself.”—*Preface to Philosophical Fragments*.

But there is another idea to which we wish to call attention in this connection, and that is, the immutable basis that is here given, drawn out, and demonstrated in the most rigid formulas of science—to the instinctive faith of the human race. “Every fact of consciousness is psychology and ontology at once, and contains already the three great ideas which science afterward divides or brings together, but which it cannot go beyond, namely, man, nature, and God. But man, nature, and God, as revealed by consciousness, are not vain formulas, but facts and realities.”\*

“If every fact of consciousness contains all the human faculties, sensibility, free activity, and reason, the me, the not-me, and their absolute identity; and if every fact of consciousness be equal to itself, it follows that every man who has the consciousness, of himself possesses, and cannot but possess, all the ideas that are necessarily contained in consciousness. Thus every man, if he knows himself, knows all the rest, nature and God at the same time with himself. Every man believes in his own existence, every man, therefore, believes in the existence of the world and of God; every man thinks, therefore every man thinks God, if we may so express it; every human proposition, reflecting the consciousness, reflects the idea of unity and of being that is essential to consciousness; every human proposition, therefore, contains God; every man who speaks, speaks of God; and every word is an act of faith and a hymn. Atheism is a barren formula, a negation without a reality, an abstraction of the mind which cannot assert itself without self-destruction; for every assertion, even though negative, is a judgment which contains the idea of being, and, consequently, God in his fullness. Atheism is the illusion of a few sophists, who place their liberty in opposition to their reason, and are unable even to give an account to themselves of what they think; but the human race, which is never false to its consciousness and never places itself in contradiction to its laws, possesses the knowledge of God, believes in him, and never ceases to proclaim him.”—*Psychology*, pp. 400, 401. Also *Spe. For. Lit.*, vol. i, pp. 147, 148.

Here we have placed upon a substantial basis the universal faith of man in a God; and also a reason for its universality, viz., it springs up as the spontaneous conviction of the mind; the simplest elements of reason extend to and comprehend it. In fact, this is the office, the proper vocation, in one sense, of all genuine philosophy. “A philosopher who makes war upon this is guilty of the same absurdity with the artist who should make war upon natural beauty.

\* The four great propositions which the moderns, almost universally, concede to natural religion, as integral parts of it, are, “1st. That there is one God; 2d. That God is nothing of those things which we see; 3d. That God takes care of all things below, and governs all the world; 4th. That he alone is the great Creator of all things out of himself.”—*Gregory's Letters on the Christian Religion, Let. III.*

Of this fact, Cousin is not only fully aware himself; but he takes unwearied pains to explain its origin, to justify its importance, and to urge its consequences upon the attention of the reader. Every primitive belief of humanity is invested in his eyes with a character of peculiar, I may say, indeed, of awful sanctity. In following the process of his investigations concerning the essential elements of reason, the absolute foundation of faith, the instinctive convictions of our race which are found, to a certain extent, in every mind, and manifested, in a certain form, in every epoch of the world, we are led to forget the impulses of merely intellectual curiosity, and to yield ourselves up—if I may so express it without temerity—to a solemn emotion of religious reverence. He gives us the true key to the meaning of those remarkable expressions, which in almost every language indicate the conviction that the voice of God is uttered in the heart of man, that the light of the soul is a light from Heaven.”

We should be glad to pursue this part of our subject further, and show the important results of the principles here advanced; but we have time only to refer the reader to the “Introductory Notice to the Philosophical Miscellanies,” from which the above extract was taken; and also to the two Prefaces to the Philosophical Fragments, in which the subject is drawn out at large. We would also refer the reader to the recapitulation in Lec. vi, *Cours de l'Histoire de la Philosophie*, Linberg's Translation, pp. 171–180, where theoretical atheism is demonstrated to be contrary to nature, and consequently inadmissible. Where the author declares that “all thought implies a spontaneous faith in God, and natural atheism has no existence;” has the scholar denied the existence of God? “Hear the man; ask him, take him at unawares, and you will see that all his words imply the idea of God; and that faith in God is, without his knowledge, at the bottom of his heart.”

#### *Pantheism of Cousin.*

It may be thought singular, that after all we have said hitherto, touching upon this subject, we should still devote a distinct portion of this article to a consideration of the charge of pantheism which is preferred against Cousin; rather, I should say, against his philosophy; for it is the *philosophy*, and not the *man*, with which we have to do. But let it be recollected with what pertinacity the charge has been made, and how often it has been reiterated; and that, too, as we fully believe, after a most attentive perusal of his works, without any just or adequate cause. We would preface to our remarks on this subject, that we, by no means, indorse every



crudity broached by Cousin ; and also repeat what we before intimated with reference to the mysticism in which the dogmas of the Catholic Church have enveloped the truths of religion. The fact should also be borne in mind, that Cousin discusses *philosophy* and not *theology* ; and whenever opinions have been expressed on religious subjects, they were expressed only because of their connection, as antecedents or as consequents, with his philosophy ; nor are they ever made with the cautious and guarded style of the theologian ; but thrown out with that frankness which ever characterizes a mind so deeply imbued with the love of truth that it can act and speak without respect to the petty squabbles of sect and party. Nor do we expect to find him propounding religious dogmas, or proclaiming God as he is exhibited in revelation ; but as he is revealed in the consciousness, *the thought of man*. The only question, then, that remains for us to discuss, is, whether the God revealed in the consciousness of man, according to Cousin, corresponds with the God made known in the Holy Scriptures ; or whether we may say of him as Cicero has, somewhere, said of Epicurus :—*Verbis reliquit Deos, resustulit*.

Let us come to the point. If Cousin advocates pantheism, that is, either the God-universe or the Universe-God—the former of which is ideal, the latter sensual pantheism—then, of course, the point is settled, and we have only to give his own views, in his own language, for the conviction of all. But, if his atheism is not expressed or avowed in his works ; and yet we find that this is the legitimate result of his system, then while we convict the *philosophy*, we may acquit the *man* ; the charitable inference would be that he did not see the consequences of his system. It is on this ground that while we reverence Locke, as a man, a philosopher, and a Christian, we cannot but discard the material tendencies of his system. To accuse Locke of being a sensualist, or a materialist, because his system led to this, would be doing him injustice ; for perhaps he never discovered the tendency of his doctrine of the origin of knowledge ; and, again, to say Locke's system did not tend to sensualism and materialism, because Locke was a Christian, would be committing a logical blunder of at least equal absurdity. The utmost caution then is to be used in applying this principle of *inference*, lest we attach to the *system* or to the *author* what does not belong to either ; and are guilty of an error no less absurd than that of the naturalist who enumerates the properties of the mistletoe in his analysis of the oak. But again, should there be some passages from which we imagine the inference may be legitimate ; but others in which the principle inferred is not only



disavowed, but another widely distant from it is distinctly and explicitly set forth, then certainly, on every principle of common courtesy and philosophical honesty, we should suspect the legitimacy of our inference, rather than question the integrity of our philosopher.

These principles lie at the foundation of all just and proper criticism, and we hesitate not to apply them to the subject before us. Is it pretended that Cousin has, himself, identified his philosophy with the "pantheism of Germany?" or with "the atheism of Spinoza?" No such charge is preferred; but Cousin is condemned, and his philosophy ostracised by *inference*. He has neither avowed nor promulgated pantheism or atheism; yet certain drivellers in philosophy, who are accustomed to raise the hue and cry of transcendentalism and pantheism, and whose pertinacity rises with their ignorance, are wonderfully suspicious of him; nay, they already denounce him. They forget that it will be time enough to denounce a man traitor when he is *convicted*, and not when he is *suspected* of treason. The usual course pursued by such critics is to select those fragmentary passages from his works, in which he has endeavored to embody and express his conceptions of God; and after exhibiting them in a form well calculated to mislead, especially when unexplained by their connections, or by the expressed opinions of Cousin, or even by the fundamental principle of his philosophy, as if they were doing a work of peculiar sanctity, they cry out lustily, *Pantheism, pantheism*. We think, if we may judge from the general tenor of such criticisms, that this cry is often raised by persons who have no very distinct conception of what the term means, or what pantheism is; and in what sense it is to be applied to him. Certain it is that the grounds on which the charge is made are as insufficient as the nature of the thing charged is vaguely understood, being mostly (as we have already intimated) the glowing and metaphysical expressions, into which almost every writer, who seeks to express his conceptions of God, naturally falls. Such expressions frequently occur in the sacred writings. They frequently occur in the eloquent sermons of our most orthodox Christian divines; indeed, almost every elevated and fervid prayer abounds with them. We are naturally led to the use of such expressions for the want of suitable terms in which to embody and express our conceptions of God, just as the philosopher who discourses of our mental faculties finds the use of material terms indispensable. And if not interpreted by the known opinions, and express and formal statements, and by the general *system* of the writer,—any body and every body may be

convicted of pantheism upon, for aught we can see, equally good grounds as Cousin. But still it has become a common-place charge against him, so that almost every school-boy who has learned to lisp the word philosophy, feels himself authorized to reiterate it. Dugald Stewart's remarks, in his digression upon Spinoza, in his Dissertation upon the Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy, are not inapplicable to this subject. After attributing to Spinoza "the revival of the old theory which represented *God as the soul of the world*," he says,—

"I am particularly anxious to direct the attention of my readers to this part of his system, as I conceive it to be at present very generally misrepresented, or, at least, very generally misunderstood; a thing not to be wondered at, considering the total neglect into which his works have long fallen. It is only in this way that I can account for the frequent use which has most unfairly been made of the term *Spinozism* to stigmatize and discredit some doctrines, *or rather some modes of speaking which have been sanctioned, not only by the wisest of the ancients, but by the highest names in English philosophy and literature*; and which, whether right or wrong, will be found, on a careful examination and comparison, not to have the most distant affinity with the absurd creed with which they have been confounded. I am afraid that Pope, in the following lines of the Dunciad, suffered himself so far to be misled by the malignity of Warburton, as to aim a secret stab at Newton and Clarke, by associating their figurative, and not altogether unexceptionable language, concerning *space* (when they called it the *sensorium* of Deity) with the system of Spinoza, as I have just explained it:—

'Thrust some mechanic cause into His place,  
Or bind in matter, or *diffuse in space*.'

How little was it suspected by the poet, when this sarcasm escaped him, that the charge of Spinozism and pantheism was afterward to be brought against himself, for the sublimest passage to be found in his writings!

'All are but parts of one stupendous whole,  
Whose body nature is, and God the soul.  
\* \* \* \* \*  
Lives through all life, *extends through all extent*,  
*Spreads undivided*, operates unspent.'

Boyle was, I think, the writer who first led the way to this misapplication of the term Spinozism; and his object in doing so was plainly to destroy the effect of the most refined and philosophical conceptions of the Deity which were ever formed by the unassisted power of human reason.

'Jupiter est quod cumque vides, quocumque moveris.'

'————— Behold around,  
How all thou seest does with the God abound,  
Jove is alike to all, and always to be found.'—*Rowe's Lucan*.

"Who but Boyle could have thought of extracting any thing like Spinozism from such verses as these !

"On a subject so infinitely disproportioned to our faculties, it is vain to expect that language will bear a logical and captious examination. Even the sacred writers themselves are forced to adapt their phraseology to the comprehension of those to whom it is addressed, and frequently borrow the figurative diction of poetry to convey ideas which must be interpreted, not according to the letter, but the spirit of the passage. It is thus that thunder is called the voice of God ; the wind, his breath ; and the tempest, the blast of his nostrils. Not attending to this circumstance, or rather not choosing to direct to it the attention of his readers, Spinoza has laid hold of the well-known expression of St. Paul, that 'in God we live, and move, and have our being,' as a proof that the ideas of the apostle, concerning the divine nature, were pretty much the same as his own ; a consideration, which, if duly weighed, might have protected some of the passages above quoted from the uncharitable criticisms to which they have frequently been exposed."—*Stewart's Works*, vol. vi, pp. 278, 279.

That Spinozism is predicated of Cousin's philosophy, on the grounds above specified, will appear evident from a slight examination of the detached passages that are usually cited to sustain the charge. The insufficiency of such grounds, we think, has been fully exhibited. We will not say that many of these passages are not in themselves objectionable ; but it is a forced construction that makes them approbate either Spinozism or pantheism. Some of them, indeed, contain bold and striking conceptions of the divine nature, elevated as they are rational, and Scriptural as they are philosophical.

In his further defense, we will let Cousin speak for himself, for his own language is not foreign or inapplicable to the subject :—

"What can be the quarrel between the theological school and myself ? Am I, then, an enemy to Christianity and the church ? I have made many lectures, and far too many books ; can a word be found in one of them inconsistent with the reverence due to sacred things ? Let a single light or doubtful expression be pointed out, and I will retract it ; I will disclaim it as unworthy of a philosopher."—*Spe. For. Lit.*, vol. i, p. 92.

Have we not here the utmost reverence expressed for Christianity ? "But," continues Cousin, "perhaps, without my knowledge or wish, the philosophy which I teach tends to weaken the Christian faith. This would be more dangerous, and, at the same time, less criminal ; for he is not always orthodox who wishes to be so." He challenges the exhibition of a single dogma of the Christian faith which his philosophy would peril ; and says,— "Let it be declared, let it be proved, let the attempt be made to prove it ; there will then, at least, be a serious and truly theological

discussion. I accept it in advance, I solicit it." But Cousin makes a formal reply to the charge of pantheism which had been repeatedly urged by the sensual school against him.

"This system, which pretends to restore spiritualism by establishing it on the basis of experience, is nothing, after all, in its last conclusions, but the celebrated system of Spinoza and the Eleatics, pantheism, which completely destroys the received notion of God and providence.\*

"It is in reply to this accusation which has found so many echoes even beyond the sensual school, that I have written a special dissertation on the Eleatic school, in which I fully explain myself on the subject of pantheism, its philosophical and historical origin, the principle of its errors, and also on that element in it which may be called good, and even useful.

"Pantheism, properly speaking, is the ascribing the divinity to the All, the grand Whole, considered as God, the Universe-God of the greater part of my adversaries. It is in its essence a kind of genuine atheism, but with which may be combined, as has been done, a certain religious vein, by applying to the world, without the slightest authority, those ideas of the Good, and the Beautiful, of the Infinite and of Unity, which belong only to the Supreme Cause, and are not to be met with in the world, except in so far as, like every effect, it is the manifestation of all the powers contained in the cause."

"Would it be thought that it is the sensual school which brings against any one the charge of pantheism, which brings it against myself? To accuse me of pantheism, is to accuse me of confounding the First, Absolute, Infinite Cause with the Universe, that is to say, with the two relative and finite causes of the me and the not-me, of which the limits and the evident insufficiency are the foundation from which I rise to the knowledge of God. In truth, I did not suspect that I should ever be called upon to defend myself from a charge like this. But if I have not confounded God and the world; if my God is not the Universe-God of pantheism, neither is he, I confess, the abstraction of Absolute Unity, the lifeless God of the scholastic theology."—*Spe. For. Lit.*, vol. i, pp. 76, 77.

Again, so far from confounding God with the universe, or the universe with God, he says,† "God is in the universe, as the cause is in its effect; as we ourselves, feeble and bounded causes, are, in so far as we are causes, in the feeble and bounded effects which we produce." Here, then, we see in what sense God is in the world, or the world in God, according to Cousin, viz.:—as "the cause is in its effect," or as "the effect is in its cause." And again,

\* Newton in his Scholium, at the end of the Principia, says,—"*Deus sine dominio, providentiâ, et causis finalibus, nihil aliud est quam Fatum et Natura.*" Cousin repeatedly propounds the same doctrine; and not unfrequently approves "the received notion of God and providence."

† Hist. Phil., pp. 142, et seq.



he explicitly declares,—“We must, therefore, regard in two different points of view, the manifestation of God in the world, and the subsistence of its divine essence itself; in order to see the true relation between the world and God.” But perhaps some would like to know what this cause, of which Cousin speaks, is in his view. He says distinctly and emphatically, and we find nothing in his philosophy that would throw the least shadow of doubt over this faith,—“A spirit, an infinite spirit, as we judge.”\*

“Are we permitted to hope—since we are not now inquiring into either nature or humanity—that this theory may escape the accusation of pantheism? Pantheism is, at this day, the bug-bear of feeble imaginations; we shall, at some other time, see what pantheism is; in the mean time I hope I shall not be charged with confounding together the world and that eternal wisdom, which, prior to the world and to humanity, exists with that triple existence which is in its nature.”—*Histoire de la Philosophie, Linberg's Translation*, p. 132.

Let it, then, be kept in mind that Cousin, in the *first place*, expressly and solemnly disclaims the imputation of pantheism, either in the *proper* or in the *improper* sense of the word; that is, he denies that he makes God to be the Great Collective All, in the proper sense of the word pantheism; or the All to be God, in the improper sense of the word. He neither confounds God with the universe, on the one hand, nor the universe with God, on the other; or, in other terms, he neither denies the *personality* and *distinct substantial* existence of God, making him nothing but *το παν*; the collective whole of things being the only substantial existence; (which is pantheism, properly speaking;) nor, on the other hand, does he deny the distinct substantial existence of the universe, of *το παν*, and make God the *only* substantial existence, (which is pantheism in the improper sense of the word,) and in which sense it is attributed to Cousin by writers in this country. But he expressly denies pantheism in either of these forms.

In the *second place*, it cannot be fairly deduced from any principle of his system; and it is contradictory to his fundamental principles, and to their most direct consequences. The whole tenor of his writings shows, that so far from doubting, he most strenuously maintains the *distinct substantial existence* of nature and of humanity; the personality, free-will, and moral responsibility of man; the absolute, essential, and immutable distinction of right and wrong;† and the unceasing obligation of the moral law. And, again, we would remark, let it be well borne in mind that his

\* Psychology, p. 214.

† Quoted by Upham, § 119, in the Abridgment of his Philosophy.

system claims for the will the most absolute freedom; that it wages unrelenting war against the scheme of necessity in all its forms; in this we discover no faint indications of the real ground of the stern opposition his philosophy has met with in certain quarters.

We do not think it necessary to pursue this vindication of Cousin's philosophy from the imputation of pantheism any further. We have given what we believe to be the proper exposition of those phrases on which the charge has been predicated; and have also let him speak in his own defense. Whatever opinions we have advanced, we believe to be amply sustained by the numerous extracts we have made from his works. We will not arrogate for our opinions any degree of infallibility; but we will claim for them that they have been candidly formed, after a most careful perusal of his works. And whenever we shall discover that we have mistaken the scope of his philosophy; or that atheism is the "kernel," covered over with the deceptive garb of professed reverence for the Holy Scriptures and the divine teachings, we shall be as ready and as frank to condemn as we are now, with our present convictions, to approve.\*

*Positive knowledge of the infinite.*

We here approach the main fundamental peculiarity of the philosophy of Cousin, viz.: *that we can obtain a positive knowledge of the infinite in spontaneous or intuitive reason.* The outlines of this doctrine are shadowed forth, neither dimly nor obscurely, in various parts of his "Fragments;" but the "*filling up*" is not quite so clear, or so satisfactory. This is indeed a peculiarity, a novel feature of philosophy; but we opine that it is an easier task to shadow forth its *generalities*, than to demonstrate it in its *details*. The doctrine may be fraught with no dangerous tendency; it may involve no pernicious consequence; but, to say the least of it, it is of doubtful validity, and liable to many and weighty objections. With regard to ourselves, whether it results from obtusity of intellect, or some other cause, we are free to confess that our conceptions of the infinite are rather dim and shadowy. In reasoning on this subject, Cousin falls far below his usual perspicuity; indeed, his argument is as illogical as his theory is unphilosophical. He discusses the idea of the infinite in its relation to time and space; and after asserting that it "unquestionably exists in the human understanding," he says,—

\* We would also refer the reader to the article on Xenophanes, in the *Nouveaux Fragmens*, p. 63, et seq.: a part of which may be found translated in a note.—*Spe. For. Lit.*, vol. i, p. 207, et seq.

"In respect to the origin of the idea of the infinite, recollect that if you had not had the idea of any body, nor of any succession, you would never have had the idea of space nor of time; but that, at the same time, you cannot have the idea of a body or of a succession, without having (necessarily awakened along with it) the idea of space or of time. Now body and succession are the finite; space and time are the infinite. Without the finite, there is for you no infinite; but, at the same time, immediately that you have the idea of the finite, you cannot help having the idea of the infinite."—*Psychology*, p. 107.

The theory seems to be, that, while body and succession fall under sensation and consciousness, space and time, that is, illimitable or infinite space and time, is revealed with equal distinctness and certainty by the reason. To our mind it is not difficult to conceive that we may form distinct notions of space and time without the attributes of illimitableness or infinity. Body involves the idea of space, we admit; and succession, whether in nature or in our own mental operations, involves the idea of time or duration; but that this space and this time are infinite is altogether a different question. And further, to reason because we have positive knowledge of the finite through sensation and consciousness, therefore we necessarily have through reason positive knowledge of the infinite, is spurring his Pegasus over a logical chasm too frightful for us to attempt. Take the infant that has never seen the "outside of the nursery," let its plaything be placed at a perplexing distance, or let it begin to notice its attendants moving round the confines of "the infant's world;" and will it not have some pretty distinct notions of body and of space? But how largely that idea shares in the attribute of infinity; or how distinctly and positively its reason, starting from these premises, grasps the idea of infinity; or rather, the positive knowledge of infinite space as its correlative, I leave the reader to judge. Consult whatever department of human science you please, and you will not fail to discover that all our *positive* knowledge in that science is limited to a few consecutive links that have been brought within the cognizance of the intellectual faculties. Go beyond this limited range, and all our ideas are vague and shadowy. We may have an idea that unexplored fields lie beyond this range, but they are as indistinct in our conceptions as their limits are conjectural. Locke affirms, b. ii, ch. 17, § 13, "We have no positive idea [knowledge] of infinity;" § 16, "We have no positive idea [knowledge] of infinite duration;" § 18, "We have no positive idea [knowledge] of infinite space." Various reasons might be urged to show that our *positive knowledge* is limited to the finite; but my limits will not admit of my pursuing the subject. The idea of the infinite is undoubtedly in the human mind; but if any one will



consult his consciousness, we think he will not fail to discover that his knowledge of space and time, and that of infinite space and infinite time, are widely different. Of the objective reality of the things answering to the two former, he has positive knowledge, but with reference to that of the two latter, he *believes*, (rather than *knows*,) because reason has given him the idea. He has the idea of space, for instance, and finds its corresponding reality in nature; he has the idea of infinite space, and *believes* (necessarily, if you will) rather than *knows* its corresponding reality.

Cousin reasons with more force, and with more seeming consistency of logic, when he comes to speak of the infinite in its relation to the Deity, as coming within the sphere of our positive knowledge; but still his reasoning is far from being conclusive or satisfactory to one who will take the trouble to penetrate within its specious exterior.

"There are men, reasonable beings, whose vocation it is to comprehend, and who believe in the existence of God, but who will believe in it only under the express condition that this existence is incomprehensible. What does this mean? Do they assert that this existence is absolutely incomprehensible? But that which is absolutely incomprehensible can have no relations which connect it with our intelligence, nor can it be in any wise admitted by us. A God who is absolutely incomprehensible by us, is a God, who, in regard to us, does not exist. In truth, what would a God be to us who had not seen fit to give to us some portion of himself, and so much of intelligence as might enable his wretched creature to elevate himself even unto him, to comprehend him, to believe in him? Gentlemen, what is it—to believe? It is, in a certain degree, to comprehend. Faith, whatever be its form, whatever be its object, whether vulgar or sublime—faith cannot but be the assent of reason to that which reason comprehends as true. This is the foundation of all faith. Take away the possibility of knowing, and there remains nothing to believe; for the very root of faith is removed. Will it be said that God is not altogether incomprehensible? That he is somewhat comprehensible? Be it so; but let the measure of this be determined; and then I will maintain, that it is precisely the measure of the comprehensibility of God, which will be the measure of human faith."—*Histoire de la Philosophie, Linberg's Translation*, pp. 132, 133.

And again he says,—

"Truth conducts then to substance in itself, to God, who, completely invisible in his essence, manifests or reveals himself to us by truth—the holy relation which unites man with God." "Since God is revealed only by truth, truth is God; it is all which it is possible for us to know concerning him."—*Spe. For. Lit.*, vol. i, p. 168.

I admit that to believe in God, to have faith in him, is to comprehend so much of the fact of his existence as is necessary to



produce this faith; but this is widely different from having positive knowledge of the infinite as constituting an element of the divine existence. Reason may comprehend the fact that God exists, without an absolute comprehension of the infinite as it exists in him.\* That which comprehends must exceed, or at least equal that which is comprehended; hence to say that the finite comprehends the infinite is absurd.† The infinite only can comprehend, that is, have positive knowledge of the infinite. Cousin evidently confounds comprehending the fact that the thing exists, with comprehending the thing itself. Now, we apprehend that to comprehend the fact of God's existence is very different from comprehending God. We admit his definition, that "faith is the assent of reason to that which reason comprehends as true." But we think it would not be difficult to show that we comprehend many things "*as true*," when the things themselves are in a measure inexplicable. Adopt this principle, "that the measure of the comprehensibility of God will be the measure of human faith," in other matters, and it will lead to the most unbounded and incurable skepticism. Indeed, we might readily show that in almost every branch of science there are numerous incontrovertible propositions—propositions which command the full measure of human faith, but are, nevertheless, incomprehensible. In natural philosophy, for instance, it has been demonstrated that electric and magnetic attractions are inversely as the squares of the distances; that at certain determinate temperatures, many solids become liquids, and liquids are transformed into æriform fluids, &c. Every man of competent understanding must yield his assent to these propositions, *must believe in them*, and yet none can pretend to any positive knowledge of the real nature of the thing to which they relate.

But, that we may depart as far as possible from theology, and also from speculative philosophy, let us instance the science of mathematics. Will it be said, as it has often been, "that here

\* Berkeley has somewhere remarked,—“My own mind and my own ideas I have immediate knowledge of; and by the help of these, do immediately apprehend the *possibility* of the existence of other spirits and ideas. Further, from my being, and from the dependency I feel in myself and my ideas, I do, by an act of reason, *necessarily* infer the existence of a God, and of all created things in the mind of God.” Reid avails himself of the same distinction, and uses Berkeley's admission “that though we cannot have an idea of God, yet we can have a *notion* of his existence,” to refute the so called demonstration of the latter, of the impossibility of the existence of material substances.

† Tertullian says,—“It is an established axiom, that which may be comprehended is less than the hands that grasp it; that which may be valued is less than the senses which rate it.”—*Apol.* 17.

every thing is not only demonstrable, but also perfectly intelligible?" No proposition can be more absurd. Will any one pretend to comprehend how a curve can continually approach a fixed right-line without the slightest possibility of ever meeting it? Still the fact is easily demonstrated by the geometrician. We might instance hyperbolas, which continually approach their assymptotes, but can never reach them, unless an assignable finite space can become equal to nothing. Again, conchoids continually approach their directrices; yet they can never meet them, unless a certain point can be both beyond and in contact with a given line at the same moment.

If our faith must necessarily be limited or incomplete where we do not perfectly comprehend, how happens it that we can compare qualities satisfactorily, in some respects, while we know nothing of them in others? Thus we can demonstrate that "any two sides of a (plane) triangle are longer than the third side"\*—by showing that angles of whose absolute magnitude we know nothing, are one greater than the other; and then inferring the truth of the proposition, from the previously demonstrated proposition, that the greater angle in a triangle is subtended by the greater side.† Again, we cannot possibly know all the terms of the infinite series:

$$\frac{1}{a^2} - \frac{2x}{a^3} + \frac{3x^2}{a^4} - \frac{4x^3}{a^5} + \frac{5x^4}{a^6} - \frac{6x^5}{a^7} + \&c., \text{ ad infin.}$$

because such knowledge implies a contradiction. Neither can we know all the terms of the infinite series:

$$\frac{1}{x^2} - \frac{2a}{x^3} + \frac{3a^2}{x^4} - \frac{4a^3}{x^5} + \frac{5a^4}{x^6} - \frac{6a^5}{x^7} + \&c., \text{ ad infin.}$$

Yet we can demonstrate that these series are equal. For the first series is produced by expanding the fraction  $\frac{1}{(a+x)^2}$ , and stands in the relation of equality to it. The second series is produced by expanding the fraction  $\frac{1}{(x+a)^2}$ , to which it is also equal. But these two fractions are equal; therefore the two infinite series are also equal. The demonstration is perfect, and commands our faith as invincibly as if we fully comprehended all the terms of each of the infinite series. For us to say then that we will believe only in that which we can absolutely comprehend, is absurd; and the principle, if rigidly adhered to in philosophical speculations, would effectually exclude us from some of the most valuable truths of science. Indeed, the adoption of such a principle, to guide and limit our investigations, would be to place before us an effectual bar against the advancement of mind; and one that could be productive only

\* Young's Elements of Geometry, b. i, prop. 21.

† Ib., b. i, prop. 19.

of evil. If, then, the principle will not bear the test when applied to those sciences which have been developed and cultivated by men; how can we expect for it validity and strength when applied to that divine science, *scientia scientiarum*, which embraces "the unsearchable God," and unfolds the relations we sustain to him?

Again,—“God reveals himself to us by truth;” “truth is God.” But is it not preposterous to say that because the mind comprehends truth, a single element of truth, therefore it comprehends all truth? God is revealed to us by truth—then, let it appear that *all truth* is revealed to us, that we have positive knowledge of all truth, and we will admit that we comprehend God, and have positive knowledge of the infinite.\* But till this is done, however wide-searching, or comprehensive the grasp of the mind, still would we say to it,—“Lo, these are parts of His ways, but how little a portion is heard of him? but the thunder of his power, who can understand?” Job xxvi, 14.

#### *Consciousness and reflection.*

On the subject of consciousness and reflection, we wish to offer a few thoughts, though our limits will not permit us to enter at large into the discussion of them. Consciousness has afforded matter for much subtil discussion among philosophers; nor do we expect to end the discussion. Locke, and, after him, his school, confound consciousness with reflection. The theory of this school seems to be that there is no immediate consciousness accompanying a mental act, independent of the act itself, that is, while the mind is thinking, the thoughts move on without the mind's having any distinct perception of any relation between the successive ideas and the thinking person. Opposed to this are two systems:—1. That which recognizes consciousness as a distinct faculty of the mind. As supporters of this theory may be ranked the Scotch philosophers, Reid and Stewart. Dr. Reid says, it “cannot be logically defined. The objects of it are our present pains, our pleasures, our hopes, our fears, our desires, our doubts, our thoughts, of every kind—in a word, all the passions, and all the actions and operations of our own minds, while they are present.”† The specification of the objects and conditions of consciousness, given by Dugald Stewart, is precisely the same as the above.‡ 2. That which makes the mental state and the consciousness of it identical. Dr. Thomas Brown contends that we are not conscious of our

\* See Chalmers' Nat. Theol., b. i, ch. 1; Collyer, vol. i, lec. 14; Locke's Essay, b. ii, ch. 17.

† Philosophy of the Human Mind.

‡ Stewart's Works, vol. ii, p. 35.

mental states apart from those states, but that they, whatever they are, constitute the consciousness of the moment. "Sensation is not the object of consciousness different from itself, but a particular sensation is the consciousness of the moment; as a particular hope, or fear, or grief, or resentment, or simple remembrance, may be the actual consciousness of the next moment."\*

Against the theory which confounds reflection and consciousness there are serious and weighty objections. We can do no more than indicate them here. *It denies to man a present knowledge of what is going on within him.* According to it, when once he is "set a thinking," he runs on till stopped by accident, or till he runs down, like a clock; and then it is only that the mind doubles back (that is, reflects) and connects the thoughts with the *me*; then it is only that I find out that I have been thinking. Let us educe the consequences of this theory: first, it negates the possibility of any such thing as a voluntary action; for how can we determine to continue, to break off, or to change a train of thought, when we cannot even know that it is *me* that is thinking, till after the train of thought has passed through the mind and it doubles back upon its experience in reflection? In fact, according to this theory, thoughts must swell the intellectual canvass, just as the wind sets the expanded arms of the windmill in motion, and one of the machines is as conscious of it as the other; only, indeed, the mind is permitted to "double back" afterward and know that it has been in motion. But we shall, with the license given us by this theory, take away even this privilege, and educe, as a second legitimate consequence, *that we can have no positive knowledge of our mental states whatever.* Apply its principles to reflection. This is an act of the mind, as well as the other; and it consequently follows that while this is occupied about our former thoughts, the mind can have no direct knowledge of the fact that it is *me* who reflects. This reflection must be the subject of another reflection, and that of another, and so on indefinitely.

With regard to the third theory, that of Dr. Brown, I think we need only to appeal to individual consciousness for its refutation. No one, it is presumed, confounds thinking with being, the mind's acts with the mind itself, or considers them identical. If this were so, the mind would consist only in activity; let there be a cessation of this activity and the mind would cease to be; let this activity be renewed and the mind would again be in the field of existence; and so it would be vibrating between entity and non-entity for ever. But we intimated that an appeal might be made to the individual

\* Brown's Philosophy, vol. i, p. 111.



consciousness ; and we think no one can fail to discover that the thought which he thinks is essentially distinct from himself, the me, the personality, who thinks ; he will discover further, that there exists a certain relation between the thought and the me, that it is the me that thinks ; the me is not merged and lost in the thought, but it stands out distinctly and independently as the cause, active in the production of its effect. But does not this suppose the mind to be existing in two states at the same time, that is, being in a state of activity, and at the same time taking cognizance of that activity ? Dr. Brown, with that dogmatism peculiar to himself, has declared,—“To suppose the mind to exist in two different states, in the same moment, is a manifest absurdity.” Yet we see no reason why the mind may not exercise more than one of its simple powers at the same time. In one sense, perception is a mental state ; emotion is another mental state ; and thinking is a mental state distinct from either. Now will it be said that the speaker cannot perceive his audience, and at the same time have his soul swayed with deep emotion and his intellect wrought up to the highest pitch of activity ? Nay, we think it will not be contended that the mind may not put into activity at one and the same time, more than one of its faculties ; for instance, perception, memory, imagination, relative suggestion. If, then, consciousness is one of the simple faculties of the mind, why may it not be exercised in conjunction with the other mental states as well as they in conjunction with each other ?

We have not time to pursue this investigation further, and will only remark that Cousin's criticism upon Locke on the subject, seems to us, for the most part, valid ; though we confess we should have been better pleased with a fuller and more critical development of the nature of consciousness. The translator of the *Psychology* has, in part, supplied the defect by an extended note on the subject.

There are several other points in the philosophy of Cousin which we intended to discuss, but must omit them on account of the length of this article. Into an examination of his analysis of the will, especially, should we have been pleased to enter ; but omit it with less regret, as it is not improbable that some future speculations may recall us to the subject in another connection.

Here we close our remarks. The convictions of our own mind on a subject of such profound interest and importance, to both philosophy and religion, have not been presented without a degree of hesitation and diffidence ; nor have they been penned without a deep sense of the mass of prejudice arrayed against those views which we have been compelled, in the main, to take. Not that we

have any great respect for, or fear of the criticisms of those purblind theologians who have no power to comprehend the reciprocal relations of philosophy and religion; and who measure every philosophical system, not by the standard of absolute truth, but by the peculiar dogmas of religious faith which they may have chanced to imbibe. The works of Cousin, we have no doubt, will have a tendency to excite a spirit of philosophical inquiry in this country. The great tendency of his philosophy is to produce *thinkers*, rather than mere disciples; yet it will meet with kindred sympathies, still more extensively, from the philosophical spirits of our country. A rigid theology would undoubtedly require that its terms be adapted to its own technicalities; but it is only a bigoted theology that would then say,—

“Odi profanum vulgus, et arceo.”

*Amenia Seminary, N. Y.*

---

ART. II.—“*The Hope of Israel;*” or, *The Restoration of Israel identified with the Resurrection of the Dead.*

THE restoration of the Jews, so abundantly foretold by the prophets, is the doctrine also of the apostles. The New Testament harmonizes with the Old Testament. Israel, the seed of the house of Jacob, are themselves in the Bible but a shadow of the heavenly family in Christ, as their tabernacle, their temple, their ritual, their Jerusalem, their Canaan, their Joshua and David, were shadows of the heavenly patterns. And as the shadow is lost in the manifestation of the substance, so does the Jew vanish in the manifestation of the sons of God, and the Jew’s Zion vanishes in the manifestation of the New Jerusalem, and his Canaan in the world to come, and his restoration vanishes in the resurrection from the dead. For all the sons of God will be restored in the likeness of their elder brother, Christ, the first fruits of the dead, at his appearing and his kingdom.

This is the true “hope of Israel:” a hope not seen in this world, a hope anchored within the veil, and to be realized when death is swallowed up in victory: at the same time we admit the inheritance of two and a half tribes on this side of Jordan. The word allows it: although we cannot explain how this part of the shadow corresponds with the substance.

The concord of the two Testaments is seen in that *the promise of the land*, (which is the promise of the LAW,) and *the restoration*

*to the land*, (which is the burden of PROPHECY,) and *the glad tidings of the kingdom*, (which is the GOSPEL of Messiah,) all meet and are fulfilled in "JESUS AND THE RESURRECTION." Their concord is further seen by observing how the most devout and learned rabbis hold by the law on the subject of the resurrection and restoration at Messiah's coming, and by observing the identity of the commonwealth of Christians and Jews in Israel, the oneness of their hopes, of their Deliverer, and of their promised land. Such are the views which we shall attempt to unfold in this brief article.

Both Moses and the prophets speak eloquently of Israel's return to their own land, to be cast out no more for ever; but Moses never, and the prophets rarely speak in plain terms of the resurrection of the dead. The New Testament discourses of the resurrection, and of the kingdom of God; but never says a word about the return of the Jews to Palestine. Moses and the prophets delight to speak of the land of promise, and of the glory of the son of David, and of the empire of the Jews; but of the world to come, and of the kingdom of heaven, they only stammer and faintly speak: while the gospel takes not the least notice of the Jewish empire in this world, but of the world to come it is full from beginning to end. Moses and the prophets did not teach one thing, and the gospel another. The law and the prophets veil the doctrine of the New Testament under the garb of Judaism. What the gospel declares, they only insinuate darkly. The Mosaic dispensation was a dispensation of types; the patterns were shown to Moses in the mount. The law was a shadow of good things to come; but the body is of Christ: the substance of the shadow is in the kingdom of heaven. The seed of the house of Jacob, the holy people, will return and come into possession of the substance in the resurrection of the dead, and in the kingdom of God.

Israel and his family names are the *types* of the chosen people of God in Christ, circumcised or uncircumcised, out of every age and nation; and Jesus is their exalted Prince and Saviour. Wherever this Prince and his people are spoken of, we may know them, although they are called in the Old Testament by the names of David, Israel, Judah, &c. We make no difficulty of understanding Christ in the prophets by the name of Joshua, or David, Zerubbabel, or the Branch; and we should also understand all his people by the name of Israel, Jacob, Ephraim, or Judah; else we mar the figure, and defeat the instruction given by the prophets. His peculiar people are neither called by their Christian name in the prophets, nor should they be mistaken by their appropriate family name, Israel: and when David is said to gather and to rule



over them in their own land *for ever*, we should consider not only that CHRIST is the David of prophecy, but that the celestial country is the seat of his throne, and the risen saints are his people gathered out of all nations, by the voice of the archangel and by the trump of God. This is the holy people whom our Joshua will lead into the heavenly Canaan, and over whom our David will reign for ever and ever.

The New Testament teaches of the coming and kingdom of Christ, in "the times of the restitution of all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began:" which is in remarkable coincidence with the doctrine of the learned and devout rabbis drawn out of the Old Testament. For the prophets with rapture, from the king on the throne to the shepherd in the fields, describe the *land*, and *people*, and *Prince* of the world to come, in names of this world; and to Christians it is plain that the Prince has burst the gates of death, and that his people follow him into the promised land by the way he went, through the grave; and to the Jewish rabbis it is plain that the country the holy people inherit is delivered from the curse of sin, and the plague of death, and is situated in the new heavens and earth wherein dwelleth righteousness.

MENASSEH BEN ISRAEL, in a treatise on the resurrection of the dead, teaches that it will occur in the days of Messiah, conjoined with Israel's deliverance and restoration to their own land in the world to come. He closes the fifth chapter of his third book in this sort: "What we have said here of the world to come, is not our invention, *but is the ancient and faithful tradition*. For, as I have before said, the rabbi Moses Gerundensis, *and all other men of learning*, by 'the last days,' (Isa. ii, 2,) understand the days of Messiah—and that *the resurrection of the dead will be joined with the gathering of the captives of Israel*." This testimony to "the ancient and faithful tradition," maintained by all Jews "of learning," that the resurrection of the dead will be joined with Israel's deliverance in the days of Messiah, may be confirmed by quotations from the most renowned rabbis, to be found in the writings of the learned Mede, Dr. Gill, and others.

The rabbi Eleazer lived in the early days of the second temple, and taught with Jonathan, the Paraphrast, who lived also before the Christian era, that Israel's return in the days of Messiah will be accompanied with the resurrection of the dead. Also the Sadducees asked Gamaliel, Paul's teacher, whence he could prove by the law, that God would raise the dead. This demand would probably puzzle the learned of a more enlightened age, who would



be forced to give it up, we fear, and to yield to the creed of the unbelieving Sadducees; for the Sadducees allowed Gamaliel no rest until he quoted Deut. xi, 21, "Which land the Lord swore unto your fathers, to give THEM:" and, from their not having received the land, Gamaliel argued that they must be raised from the dead, or in respect to *them* the promise would fail, which is impossible. Many are the proofs of the sort quoted by Gamaliel, and besides these we know not any stronger in the five books of Moses, to convince us of the resurrection of the dead. And so far as these texts go to prove that doctrine, they identify it with "the hope of Israel," even their restoration to the promised land. Rabbi Kimchi on Isa. xxvi, 19, "Thy dead men shall live," says, "The holy blessed God will raise the dead at the time of Israel's deliverance." Another says, "When the King Messiah comes, the holy blessed God will raise up them that sleep, as it is written: He will swallow up death in victory."

The promises and threatenings of the Old Testament are usually addressed in the second person, *to you*, and not in the third person, *to them*, who may come after: and to be literally fulfilled, as all promises should be, those to whom they were personally spoken, *you*, of all generations, must live again. Of these promises, the restoration of Israel to their own land is among the most frequent and important, and if Gamaliel's and Ben Israel's interpretation be correct, it settles the question of their return, as an event of the world to come. This interpretation is spiritual, is personal, and it is of universal application, and of eternal moment to the faithful, whether Jews, Medes, Parthians, Greeks, Romans, or Americans; it conforms exactly to the doctrine of the New Testament; it repels the error of the Sadducees; and it preserves, in the highest degree, the testimony of Jesus in the spirit of the ancient prophecies. We cannot see any reasonable objection to it in the mind of a Gentile; a Jew born may object, that it allows him no pre-eminence; though if his faith and truth do not obtain him pre-eminence, it may be doubted whether his being a son of Abraham will.

A learned rabbi quoted by Gill on Matt. xxii, 31, says, "The holy blessed God promised to our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, that he would give *them* the land of Israel. Hence we learn that they will be raised, and that hereafter God will give *them* the land of Israel." But Paul is most explicit when he identifies "*the hope of the promise made of God unto the fathers*" with the hope of the resurrection from the dead, of which he was called in question by the Jews; and again with "the hope of

Israel," for which he was bound with a chain. Paul's interpretation did not satisfy his enemies, who pursued him as a ringleader of the Nazarenes; but it accords with Gamaliel's; it satisfied the Pharisees, who rose up in the council, and strove for him; and it should satisfy Christians.\*

The promise of *the land* is the promise of the law: *the restoration* to the land is the burden of the prophets: and the *glad tidings* of the kingdom at hand is the gospel of Jesus Christ our Lord. In him all the promises, the prophecies, and glad tidings meet; in him they unite; in him they will be fulfilled together. He is the King of glory, who will recover his people from the land of their enemies, sin and death, and will lead them into the promised land of eternal life, and will give them rest; and he will rule over them with equity for ever. This is the law and the prophets; this is the gospel of Christ and of the kingdom of heaven; this is "the hope of Israel," a people to be manifested in the resurrection of the dead.

"All are not Israel who are of Israel;" and many are Israel who have not the blood of Jacob in their veins. We call on Israel's God as our God; we invoke his blessing, and expect the answer for the Christian *church*, the modern Israel, and heirs of the *promises*, as well as the *name*, of Israel. God is not the God of the Jews only; Christ is not the King of the Jews only; but of all the faithful: and what is a restoration to Palestine in the flesh to the faithful among the Gentiles? Let the natural seed have this Jerusalem: to the spiritual seed belongs the inheritance of the New Jerusalem, which has foundations, and Jesus her Lord. This is the spirit of prophecy. Let the natural seed take their

\* "It was the opinion of the Jews that there should be a resurrection in the days of Messiah. The Chaldee paraphrast on Isa. xlix, 8, reads, 'I give thee for a covenant to the people, to raise the righteous that lie in the dust.' Kimchi on Isa. xxvi, 19, says, 'The holy blessed God will raise the dead at the time of deliverance.' And on Jer. xxiii, 20, 'In that he saith *ye* shall consider it and not *they* shall consider it, it intimateth the resurrection of the dead.' Aben Ezra on Dan. xii, 2, says, 'The righteous that died in the captivity shall revive when the Redeemer cometh'—and this was so far the opinion of the nation that they understood the term '*the world to come*,' of the days of Messiah."—*Lightfoot*, vol. v, p. 255: quoted by Vint, p. 298.

Vint also quotes as follows:—"They shall be gathered from their captivity; they shall sit under the shadow of their Messiah; and the dead shall live."—*Targum on Hos. xiv, 8*.

"The Jews call the world to come, the times of Messiah."—*Gill*, Heb. iv, 9.

From such testimony to the prevalent opinions of the Jews as is borne by Menasseh Ben Israel, Lightfoot, Mede, and Gill, the learned reader can make no appeal; for higher authorities cannot easily be found.

inheritance in this world, even the kingdom of this world : to the spiritual seed belongs the kingdom of heaven. Give Palestine to the natural Israel, and they will possess what Abraham did not : he only pitched his tent there ; he sojourned in Palestine with a promise. So his seed, Christ, sojourned with the gospel ; and his spiritual seed live as pilgrims, seeking a city, and dying in the faith of a better country, and in the hope of a better resurrection ; Israel's hope according to the law and to the gospel. Give Israel *all the world*, and they could have it but a few days ; they should despise it in the faith of the glory which is to be revealed in the celestial world to come. This is the spirit of the promises and of the prophecies ; this is the gospel of Jesus Christ, and of his kingdom ; this is "the hope of Israel."

Bring into one field of view the entire prophecies relating to "the hope of Israel," and the doctrine will be found upright in the resurrection, supported in all its connections by life from the dead ; and unshaken by carnal views of divine favor to the natural seed of Abraham. To this the literalist objects : "The resurrection of the body is repeatedly used by the prophets to typify the political revival of Judah and Israel."—*Faber*.

We are also literalists, and as such we maintain the literal word of prophecy, *respecting the resurrection of the dead* ; and as literalists, we protest against subverting the doctrine of the resurrection, and robbing it of its *heavenly* glory, to typify a scene of *political* glory in this transitory world : we protest against burying the holy doctrine of the resurrection, and of the New Jerusalem, under the carnal rubbish and dust of Jerusalem secular and political : for, if the Scripture passages concerning the resurrection, used by the literalists to typify the national return, and the political dominion of the carnal Jews, be turned from their literal interpretation, the Old Testament light of immortality is extinguished, its rays are quenched in the darkness and dreams of Judaism ; its vital power is submerged in the dead sea of Sadducean unbelief : for the Old Testament does not speak of the resurrection, except it be in those passages which the learned, devout, and honored defenders of the literal interpretation usually quote for the political use and benefit of the natural seed of Abraham. They inadvertently rob the Pharisee of the staff of "the hope of Israel ;" and they make a covenant with the Sadducees to overthrow the faith of the ancient Scripture doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. They are no longer *literalists*, when they turn plain descriptions of the resurrection into political types and figures of worldly glory ; and when they interpret the prophecies which promise life from the dead,



chiefly for the revival of the national glory, secular power, and wide dominion of the natural Israel. They are not literalists, when they turn away from the literal interpretation put by the Holy Spirit in the New Testament on the letter of the Old Testament: "They which are of *faith*, the same are the *children* of Abraham." "If ye be Christ's, then are ye *Abraham's seed*, and heirs according to the promise:" that is, heirs of the *promised land*, given to Abraham and his seed. Gal. iii, 7.

*Inexplicable Prophecies of Messiah and the Jews.*

We neither know how to alter nor to amend the doctrine already taught; but we can add to it what we have no rational powers consistently to join; therefore, we attempt the junction, by the aid of a well-known fact for a sodering illustration.

The prophets foretold that Messiah would be a man of sorrows, and also the Saviour of Israel; that he would be despised and rejected of men, maltreated, and scourged; and also that he would be the King of glory; that he would be sold for money, and cut off, not for his own sins; and also that he would reign over his people on the throne of his father David for ever. Now, had we lived in the days of the Maccabees, and sought to know the whole truth relative to Messiah, we could never have reconciled these matters in any conception we might have formed. One prophecy would have so clashed with another, that we could not have imagined their union in one person. Had we described Messiah as glorious and renowned; Nay, one might say, he will be despised and rejected of men. Had we supposed he might be put to death as a malefactor; Nay, one might say, he will live and reign for ever; and so far from being put to death, he will slay all his enemies. Had we supposed his price would be counted out in silver, at the rate of a common slave, how could we reconcile it with his coming of the royal line of David, and swaying the sceptre of universal empire? We do not learn that the scribes, or rabbis, disputed on these points; though they could not tell how he should be David's Lord, and David's son. They steadfastly looked for him, and their eyes were dazzled with the promises of his glory, so they failed to recognize him in his humility, even when they saw the miracles which he wrought. The delightful theme of the prophets is the majesty of his wide dominion, the eternity of his throne, the righteousness of his sceptre, the perfection of his people, the splendor of his crown; and, overwhelmed by this display of glory, the believers of the prophets gave no heed to the mysterious notices of his sufferings, humiliation, and cruel death. We



should have fallen into the same error ; we should not have known him ; or walking with him, as his disciples did, we should have fled, when the high priest took him ; and though our hearts bled, we should have given him up when the Romans nailed him to the tree between two thieves. We should have returned home in sadness, not only for the base death of the innocent Jesus, but also for the grievous disappointment of our trusted hope, that it had been he who should have redeemed Israel. Yet these things were revealed ; and now they are fulfilled, we see them so distinctly that we wonder at the Jews' blindness, and hardly suspect that we might have fallen into the same dazzling error, or do fall into one still more glaring.

This is the fact : the illustration follows.

The restoration of the captive daughter of Zion, and the return of Israel to the land of promise, are no less magnificent themes of heavenly prophecy than the glories of the son of David, who will gather them from their dispersions, and lead them from Jerusalem to victory, and to empire over the conquered world. Indeed, the *two* themes are everywhere united in close relations, and, doubtless, they belong to the same time, as they do to the same Deliverer ; and they are mainly one and the same great event ; to wit : "The hope of Israel," the coming of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the gathering of the chosen people out of all countries to meet the Lord in the air ; while this world and its Jerusalem pass away, and the New Jerusalem comes down with new heavens to the new earth. This seems to be the great and glorious truth veiled, and yet revealed, in the promise of the Jews' return to Jerusalem ; the great truth is "Jesus and the resurrection," and through Jesus the resurrection of the just, who are found worthy to obtain that world. From the name and character of the Prince, we must infer the name and character of the people ; and from the nature of his coming, we must infer the nature of their return. He is not carnal, nor are the weapons of his warfare carnal, nor are his people carnal. But all this does not absolutely forbid a return of the Jews in the flesh. Many texts seem to require us to believe that they shall be gathered in Palestine of this world. The passage, Deut. xxx, 1-8, is of this number ; and others are found hard to be understood, without a restoration of the *natural* Israel. These may, with improved and keener vision, all be consistently explained of the resurrection ; or they *may* accurately describe a minor part in the grand drama of time, yet to be performed, introductory to the overwhelming scene of the resurrection and the judgment day. It is impossible for us always to discriminate between the restoration of the natural and of the spiritual Israel,

if they be two distinct and future events. We cannot understand how the race of the first Adam is to be continued in the world, after the present dispensation ends: how the race of the first Adam can be transferred in the blood to the new earth, and yet "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," 1 Cor. xv, 50. When the Lord comes, the graves are opened, he judges the quick and the dead, he gives to both small and great their reward, he changes the faithful, both living and dead, into the likeness of his own glorious body, he takes away the sins of his people, he cuts off all the ungodly race, and makes all things new, holy, and immortal; and in this state, it is impossible to conceive how any of the race of old Adam can be left, though they may be natural children of Abraham. But the words and ways of God are above our thoughts: men before the deluge could not tell how the flood should come; men before the birth of Christ could not tell how Messiah should come; and now the understanding is probably darkened relative to the manner of his second coming. Many illustrious particulars we know, but no man can sketch them in one fair group, giving its proper time and place, and due proportion to each one, sorting out every one which does not belong to the scene, and neglecting none that will appear conspicuous in that day. Especially are the prophecies relative to the natural Jews a tissue difficult to weave into the immortal picture, if they belong in it. A learned rabbi thanks Christians for allowing his nation all the evils of their dispersion literally, while denying them the benefit of a literal restoration. He would like to have the literal benefit, as well as the literal curse; which seems reasonable. The Jews are universally expecting such a restoration, and stand ready to march at Messiah's command.

But this political restoration is involved in impenetrable obscurity. They are not to constitute the fifth monarchy, though they think they are. That monarchy belongs to the saints of the Most High, and is the next great event to come in the order of prophecy, and in the succession of time, after the fourth, which is now upon the stage, has passed away. The hope of that monarchy is eminently the hope of the natural Israel. They believe Messiah will give it them; and they did believe John and the Lord Jesus meant that kingdom when they preached, "*The kingdom of heaven is at hand.*" Even so "the promise made of God unto the fathers, unto which promise our twelve tribes, instantly serving God day and night, hope to come," is eminently the hope of Christian Israel, or "the saints of the Most High;" that Messiah will return and come with myriads of saints triumphant over death and the

grave, to reign on the earth. Paul cherished this hope: "Believing all things which are written in the law and the prophets." Paul had "hope which they (the Jews) themselves also allow, that there shall be a resurrection of the dead, both of the just and of the unjust," Acts xxiv, 14. For preaching this hope, *through Christ*, Paul felt himself accused by the chief priests at Jerusalem; and at Rome he declared to his countrymen, "For THE HOPE OF ISRAEL I am bound with this chain." These things persuade us, that Paul understood "the hope of Israel" to be "the kingdom of heaven" in the resurrection of the dead, which he labored through life with his might to attain: "If by any means," said he, "I might attain unto the resurrection of the dead," Phil. iii, 11:—and that he understood the ingrafting of Israel again to be nothing "but life from the dead."\*

To this result all our demonstrations come with the same fidelity that the needle points to the pole, whatever way we turn the compass, or the figure. In the succession of prophetic empires the God of heaven has revealed the course of empire to the end of time. The fourth monarchy is now generally acknowledged to be

\* *Tertullian* on the Resurrection says, (p. 408, A., Paris ed., folio, A. D. 1634,) "The apostles taught of the resurrection nothing new, except they preached it in the day of Christ's glory. The doctrine itself is familiar to the Old Testament. So Paul before the Sanhedrim said, I am a Pharisee, the son of a Pharisee; and of the hope, and of the resurrection of the dead, I am called in question before you. So, likewise, before Agrippa, he said, *he advanced nothing BEYOND what the prophets have taught*: therefore, he professed the doctrine of the resurrection, also, just as the prophets proclaim it. By Moses the Lord declared that he will require at the hand of every man and of beast, the blood of the slain; that is, he will restore the slain; he will recover them from the hand of their murderers. Nor did the Athenians understand Paul otherwise when they mocked; for they would not have mocked him only at hearing of the restoration of the *soul*. That was the prevalent doctrine of their philosophy."

*St. Chrysostom* says on Heb. xi, of the promises to the fathers, "To thee will I give this land (earth) and to thy seed:" "It is said not to thee *in thy seed*; but to thee *and thy seed*; and neither he, (Abraham,) nor Isaac, nor Jacob, obtained the promise; for it is said, 'All these died in the faith, not having received the promises; but seeing and recognizing them afar off.' Here a mystery is implied; to wit, that all this which was promised, they understood to belong to future times, the resurrection, the kingdom of heaven, and the other things of which Christ preached."

*St. Irenæus* says, "In that flesh in which they suffered, the saints will receive the reward of their labors; especially since the whole creation expects it, and God has promised it to Abraham and his seed."—*Iren. Contra. Her.*, lib. 32.

"It is necessary that he should receive it with his seed (that is, they who fear God and trust in him) in the resurrection of the just."—*Ibid.*



in the extreme part of the last stage of its duration : and it is to be supplanted, not by the kingdom of the carnal Jews, we think ; but by the kingdom of the saints and of heaven, which shall never pass away nor be destroyed. The Jews appropriate the promises and the prophecies to their own peculiar use, and among them this of Daniel the prophet, relative to the fifth monarchy : they suppose it will be a Jewish empire : but no Christian supposes any such thing, except with material qualifications. “ *They which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness, shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ,*” Rom. v, 17. “ *The saints shall judge the world,*” 1 Cor. vi, 2. “ *We (Corinthians) shall judge angels,*” *ibid.* “ *When the Son of man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel,*” Matt. xix, 28. It is not credible that the twelve tribes of Israel here mean the natural seed of Abraham only, any more than that Christ is the Saviour of those tribes only, or any more than it includes every individual of those tribes, both bad and good. “ *To him that overcometh will I grant to sit with me in my throne :—to him will I give power over the nations,*” Rev. ii, 26, and iii, 21. “ *And we shall reign on the earth ;*”—“ *and they shall reign for ever and ever,*” Rev. v, 10, and xxii, 5. “ *And the kingdom and the dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him,*” Dan. vii, 27.

These and a multitude of similar passages : “ *Thy kingdom come, thy will be done in earth,*”—prove there is to be a final or fifth monarchy, *in the earth*, universal and eternal, under the sceptre of *Messiah and the risen saints*, according to the New Testament, but of *Messiah and the restored Jews*, according to the Old Testament. Wherefore, plainly, these people with two names and one king may be one and the same people, as much as the English and the British are one : for they have the same Messiah, the same empire, and the same eternal reign. They are called in the Old Testament Jews and Israelites : and in the Gospel they are called saints and Christians : their empire begins in the coming of Messiah in his glory, and is called in the Law and the Prophets *Israel's return to the promised land* ; and is called in the Gospel *the kingdom of heaven*, the abode of the risen dead : and of this kingdom there is to be no end. Agreeing in these particulars, in one king, in one universal and eternal empire, “ *under the whole heaven,*” it seems impossible but that the citizens of the empire should be one people, notwithstanding they are called by various names.



To carry out this mode of reasoning still further, we briefly notice some of the peculiar beauties of contemplating "the hope of Israel" in the identity of the promises made to the Jews and Christians; in the oneness of their hopes, their king, and their fellow-citizens; the country of their dispersion, their promised land, and restoration, and the time of their deliverance.\* If we mistake not, Israel of the Old Testament embraces Christians of the New Testament; the promises to the former are promises to the latter; the hope of the promise, and the hope of Israel, are the same in both Testaments; and the promised empire and holy land are the same kingdom of Christ and of heaven in both Testaments:

\* *Justin Martyr*, speaking of Joshua as a type of Christ, says: "He gave them a temporal inheritance; but this Jesus, after the resurrection, will give us an eternal possession. Whence, from whatever country, whether slaves or freemen, believers in Christ know that they shall be together with him in that land, and possess it for an everlasting and incorruptible inheritance."—*With Trypho*, sec. 113, 135.

*St. Cyprian* comments thus on the words of the Lord's Prayer, Thy kingdom come:—"We pray for the coming of that our kingdom, which has been promised to us by God, and was gained by the blood and passion of Christ, that we who have continued his subjects in the life below, may afterward reign in Christ's kingdom, according to his own promise and word, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world.'" Thus he identifies the kingdom to come in the earth with the kingdom of the saints' inheritance in glory with Christ on his throne. The Assembly's Catechism interprets the prayer in the same manner. Likewise *St. Jerome* interprets it in the same manner, and adds this remark: "How much boldness and purity of conscience it requires to ask for the kingdom of God [to come] and not fear the judgment!"

*St. Cyril* of Jerusalem, A. D. 350, says: "This Jesus who hath ascended cometh again from heaven, not from earth: and I say *not from earth*, because many antichrists are now to come from earth: for, as thou hast seen, many have already begun to say, *I am Christ*. And, besides, there is to come the abomination of desolation, usurping the name of Christ: but *do thou look for the true Christ*, the Son of God, the only begotten, who is henceforth to come, not from the earth, but from heaven, appearing to all brighter than any lightning or other brilliance, with angels for his guard, that he may judge the quick and dead, and reign with a kingdom heavenly, eternal, and without end."—*Oxf. Trans.*, p. 41.

But what is more than all are the comments of the evangelist on the prophecy of Caiaphas: "And this spake he (Caiaphas) not of himself; but being high priest that year, he prophesied that Jesus should die for that nation; and not for that nation only, but that also *he should gather together in one the children of God that were scattered abroad*," John xi, 51, 52. The above follows the resurrection of Lazarus, and shows how the holy people will be gathered and restored to the promised land, "not of that nation only," but of all "the children of God."

the two Testaments being two witnesses whose *language* differs, while their *testimony* is the same ; the future things spoken by the prophets to the Jews being preached by the gospel to the Gentiles. This seems to be "the testimony of Jesus" and "the spirit of prophecy," while the other doctrine, that the Jews in the flesh are to be the masters of the world, seems to be rank and intolerable Judaism.

*The identity of the promise and the hope of Israel with Christianity.*

Abraham, "the father of us all," Rom. iv, 16, was a type of Christ: his chosen seed and faithful are a type of Christians. The promise to Abraham and his seed, ("which is Christ,") is the inheritance of the land; "that he should be the heir of the world," Rom. iv, 13. And Christians have assurance: "If ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." That *Abraham* should be the heir of the world seems to be too much, except through his seed, "which is Christ:" and whatever Abraham inherits through Christ, all true believers will: therefore, the Jews have no pre-eminence under the Christian dispensation: the promise to Abraham is a promise to all who believe; and peculiar to the true Israel, but not to the circumcised in the flesh only. The promise of Canaan to Abraham was typical: and he so understood it; for he died in the faith, hoping to receive it in a better resurrection. He did not realize the promise, except by faith; nor did Gideon, nor Barak, nor Jephtha, Samson, David, Samuel, nor the prophets, "of whom the world was not worthy;" though they ruled, reigned, lived, died, and were buried in Canaan, and through faith subdued kingdoms, wrought wonders, and obtained promises: "These *all*, having obtained a good report through faith, *received not the promise*; God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect," Heb. xi, 39, 40. Therefore, *they must rise*, as Christ did, to receive their promised inheritance. As it was with Abraham and the patriarchs, Samuel and the prophets, and David and the kings, it will probably be with all Jews: were they restored to Palestine to-day, they could not have it more than Jephtha, Samuel, and David had it: but as *their* possession was not the *promised* possession; neither would the possession by the modern Jews be the *promised* possession. As those died in the faith, in order to come into the land of promise, so must the modern Jews, though they reigned in Jerusalem again, and all nations obeyed them; they must still die in the faith of a better resurrection, before they

could inherit the promised land. And as it was with Christ, it must surely be with all Christians. His *hope* was not in this world; and their promised inheritance belongs not to time. The promises to Abraham and to Christ are not paid in this world. Those who inherit with them will not expect it in this mortal life, but in the resurrection and eternal life. Except the present race of Jews have a promise different from their father Abraham, their king David, and their prophet Samuel, (which they do not pretend, and we do not believe,) they too must place *their* hope, where "the hope of Israel" lies, in the resurrection of the dead, and in the habitable world to come. Although they should be by a miraculous power brought back in the eyes of all nations, the pillar of cloud by day, and of fire by night, leading their march, they could not, they *could* not possess Judea more effectually than the judges and David did: they must have a new promise, or they have none in this world; for even such restoration would not give them more of Palestine than David had, who yet died in the faith. And Israel, though restored in the flesh, must still, like him, die in the faith, in order to come into their promised inheritance.

All who rightly practice infant baptism are wont to regard the promise made to Abraham and his seed as made to them also, and to their children. Therefore, the promises to Abraham and his seed ("which is Christ," and his faithful followers in all ages and nations) are one and identical; there is no difference: they belong not to this world of sorrow and death, but to the Canaan of joy and eternal life. The Old and New Testament church and covenant are one and the same, in Abraham and his seed.

The identity of "the true hope of Israel," whether in Jews, or in Christians, may be inferred from the identity of the promises on which that hope rests, and of the King who gave and who will redeem the promises. We seem to have demonstrated the identity of the promises to Abraham and his seed "which is Christ," and to his people called in the New Testament, Christians, but in the Old Testament, Israel. We next observe this

*Identity in Messiah, the King of Jews and Christians.*

Abraham, "the father of us all," saw Christ's day, and was glad; (John viii, 56;) because in that day he will receive his inheritance of faith, and Israel will realize his hope. The King on the throne will in that day reward all his faithful, from Adam to the last man changed at the Lord's coming. The Jews acknowledge Messiah to be their Deliverer, their Lawgiver, and their everlasting King;



but they do not confess Jesus to be the Messiah, albeit, when he comes again *they* will cry: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."—Is Christ divided? Is he the King of the natural Jews only? Does he speak a gracious promise to the circumcised only, when he says: "I will surely assemble, O Jacob, *all of thee*, I will surely gather the remnant of Israel;—their King shall pass before them, and the Lord on the head of them?" Micah ii, 12, 13. "The Lord shall utter his voice before his *army*, his *camp* is very great; for he is strong that executeth his word: for the day of the Lord is very great and terrible; who can abide it?" Joel ii, 11. His army is not a carnal host of natural Jews; his camp is the camp of the saints; and the day of the Lord is the great day of judgment: who can abide it in the flesh?—"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that I will raise unto David a righteous BRANCH, and a King shall reign and prosper, and shall execute judgment and justice *in the earth*: in his days Judah shall be saved, and Israel shall dwell safely; and this is his name whereby he shall be called, THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS. Therefore, behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that they shall no more say, The Lord liveth, which brought up the children of Israel out of the land of Egypt; but, The Lord liveth, which brought up, and which led *the seed of the house of Israel* out of the north country, and from all countries whither I had driven them; and they shall dwell in their own land," Jer. xxiii, 5.

Christians know who is "THE LORD OUR RIGHTEOUSNESS;" that he is the King of Israel, and "the Saviour of all men," not specially of the Jews, but "specially of them that believe," 1 Tim. iv, 10. And were Messiah to reign over the carnal Jews without including Christians, then the Jews' hope, and the King of the Jews, would seem not to be Jesus of Nazareth, our hope and our King. But who that believes in the New Testament can believe this? Christ is not the King of the natural seed of Abraham at all: they are Ishmaelites, children of the Egyptian Hagar, a bond-woman; and, except they be born again, they cannot inherit with the sons of the free woman, which is Jerusalem above, the true holy land. Gal. iv. To that land Christ will lead his chosen and faithful, "the seed of the house of Israel," and they shall dwell in their own heavenly land. He is the King of Israel, and "the hope of Israel."—"And we declare unto you GLAD TIDINGS, how that the promise which was made unto the fathers, God hath fulfilled the *same* unto us their children, in that he hath raised up Jesus again," Acts xiii, 32, 33. By this word the Holy Spirit stamps the promise made of God unto the fathers with the seal of the



resurrection, and crowns Jesus with the glad tidings, to the Jews first, and then to all people.

*The identity of the people demonstrated; Israel and Christians one.*

This has been done in passing; nevertheless, we show it also in its order. As the promise, and the hope and the King of Israel belong not to the flesh, and neither come of the flesh, nor follow in the line of the flesh; but come from the Holy Spirit of promise, and follow in the line of the spiritual seed, and will be fulfilled and realized in Jesus and the resurrection; it follows that the true Israel are a spiritual seed, as all true Christians are, Abraham being the father of us all. Rom. iv, 16. True Christians, like Christ, and true Jews, like Abraham, Samuel, and David, must live by faith, and die in hope, and rise from the dead to possess the promised inheritance. The Holy Spirit defines the meaning of the word Jew in the New Testament; and we may safely apply the same meaning to it in the Old Testament, in many places. "He is not a Jew which is one outwardly,—but he is a Jew which is one inwardly," Rom. ii, 28. "They are not all Israel who are of Israel," but only those who are circumcised of heart. They only can inherit the promise to whom the promise was made; and they are Jews inwardly. The promise was made to the spiritual seed, "which is Christ:" the natural children cannot inherit it. The Promiser will pay to the Promisee, and to no other, except through him. The Promisee is Christ, in whom Christians are Abraham's seed, true Jews, "and heirs according to the promise." He hath broken down the middle wall of partition between us, and made in himself of twain one new man, bringing the Gentile aliens and strangers into the commonwealth of Israel, and the covenants of promise by his blood.\* Eph. ii. The identity of the people is therefore complete in Christ the Lord; and to say they are not one, is blasphemous: to say that the Gentiles are aliens still, that they are not in the covenants of promise, and are not entitled to "the hope of Israel," as free citizens of the holy Jerusalem, would seem to be a contradicting of the Holy Ghost.

\* An alien, or a stranger, made a free citizen of the commonwealth, becomes a commonwealth's man, and takes the *name and privileges* of the commonwealth's people, whether Greeks or Jews. So the Gentiles, being made free of the commonwealth of Israel, take the name and privileges of Israelites; as a naturalized foreigner becomes an American citizen, entitled to inherit and vote as an American.

*The country of Israel's dispersion.*

The holy people, whether Jews or Christians, lie buried in all lands, especially in the northern hemisphere. The country of their dispersion is the wide world, and the narrow grave: but they are to be gathered and restored; this is their hope. "They shall see the Son of man coming in the clouds of heaven with power and great glory, and he shall send his angels with a great sound of a trumpet, and they shall gather together his elect from the four winds, and from one end of heaven to the other," Matt. xxiv, 30. "Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord," 1 Thess. iv, 17. All the elect, "the seed of the house of Jacob," are to be thus gathered under Messiah, in one body, never to leave him more. "His camp is very great;" "Their king shall pass before them, the Lord on the head of them." By the prophet Ezekiel the Lord expresses a similar purpose: "I will take you from among the heathen, and gather you out of all countries, and will bring you into your own land.—A new heart also will I give you, and a new spirit will I put within you, and ye shall dwell in the land that I *gave* to your fathers; and ye shall be my people, and I will be your God.—In the day that I shall have cleansed you from all your iniquities, I will also cause you to dwell in the cities, and the wastes shall be builded," Ezek. xxxvi, 24-33.

Having thus declared his purpose, promising *them*, not their descendants, a return to the holy land, a new heart, and a new spirit, when he had cleansed them from all their iniquities, the Holy Spirit, in the next chapter, unfolds the way of accomplishing all this at once to every generation of Israel, by the vision of the valley of dry bones: the most particular description of the resurrection found in the Old Testament, which, if understood in a figure instead of a fact, is less than the chaff to the wheat. The sublimest record of prophecy, describing the most glorious event of man's existence, his resurrection from the dead, is often taken for a sketch of temporal politics, covering the plain doctrine of the resurrection to eternal life with the fantastic triumph and reign of Judaism in mortality. Wherever else the doctrine of the resurrection is found, it is illustriously recorded in the thirty-seventh chapter of Ezekiel: "Thus saith the Lord God, Come from the four winds, O breath, and breathe upon these slain, *that they may live*. So I prophesied as he commanded me; and the breath came into them, and they lived, and stood up upon their feet, an exceeding great army. Then he said unto me, Son of man, these

bones are the whole house of Israel. Behold, they say, Our bones are dried, and our hope is lost; we are cut off for our parts. [They say: We are dying; our hope in Israel is cut off; we have no part in the promised inheritance of the land.] Therefore prophecy and say unto them, Thus saith the Lord God, Behold, O my people, I will open your graves, and cause you to come up out of your graves, and bring you into the land of Israel. And ye shall know that I am the Lord, when I have opened your graves, O my people, and brought you up out of your graves, and shall put my Spirit in you, and ye shall live; and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the Lord have *spoken it*, and *performed it*, saith the Lord," Ezek. xxxvii, 9-15. Then follows a description of the mode of their habitation under David their king for ever in their own land, and the new covenant of everlasting peace.

Words cannot make this plainer. "Hath he *said*, and shall he not do it? or hath he *spoken*, and shall he not make it good?" Num. xxiii, 19. The country of Israel's dispersion, Jews and Christians, is this world, the realm of sin and death, the king of terrors: but a Deliverer is coming, who will assemble the dispersed of Israel, and lead captivity captive from the prison-house of death, and set his prisoners free. "Who hath heard such a thing?" exclaims Isaiah; "who hath seen such a thing? Shall the earth be made to bring forth in one day? Shall a nation be born at once? For as soon as Zion travailed, she brought forth her children," Isa. lxvi, 8.\* Them that sleep in Jesus will God bring with

\* *St. Irenæus*, in ch. 34 of his book against the heretics, discourses freely of the kingdom of the saints, in the new earth at the resurrection of the just, which that eminent divine of the second century unfolds in citations from Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, and the parable of the watchful servant to whom the Lord gave the government at his coming. He quotes from Isaiah xxvi, 19, "Thy dead men shall live:" from Ezek. xxxvii, 12, "Behold, O my people, I will open your graves." Also Ezek. xxviii, 25, "When I shall have gathered the house of Israel from all people among whom they are scattered;" which he takes to be all saints in the resurrection of the dead, exactly in the sense of this article.

*St. Chrysostom*, on the second chapter of Isaiah, claims the promises there made in the Jews' name for all Christians of the Gentiles, nothing wondering at the use of Jewish terms in that chapter: for, what was spoken was adumbrated by the use of the names, Jerusalem and the Jews, as David, in the name of Solomon, prophecies of a far greater than Solomon, and as Jacob, on his death-bed, addressed his son Judah by name, and in his name gave promise of Messiah: "To him shall the gathering of the Gentiles be." With many examples of this sort, what wonder if the names of Israel be used by the prophets to convey promises and prophecies appropriate to the Gentile church?



him. All the sons of God will be manifested, as their elder Brother was, by the resurrection: and the earth will bring forth in the great day of the Lord a nation at once, "a holy nation, a peculiar people:" sifted among all nations, like wheat, but not one grain shall be lost. These things are otherwise understood by the many; but when the Lord, who has spoken it, has also performed it, he will open the graves of *his people*, and bring up his people out of their graves, and he will put a new heart and a new spirit in them, and will bring them into the land which he *gave* to Abraham and his seed; and he will be their King for ever. If this be not the resurrection, language fails to teach that doctrine: it accomplishes the fullness of both Jews and Gentiles, when "all Israel shall be saved" from the land of their dispersion, which is this land of death.

*The land of promise to Israel.*

The land of their captivity and dispersion being "this present evil world," the people of God have the promise of "a better country, even a heavenly,"—which is the world to come. Their captivity is the state of death; their deliverance is from mortality and the grave; and their restoration is to immortality and the paradise of God. All the prophets expatiate on the glories of the promised land, and the triumph of Israel's return to it. The imagery is earthy, and cannot fail to blind the eyes which look not through the drapery of clouds to "the testimony of Jesus" in the clouds. But when we read, as in Isaiah lx, 20, "The Lord shall be thine everlasting light, and the days of thy mourning shall be ended," we perceive that the description belongs to the world to come, eternal joy and light not being promised to any condition of this world. "For in their land they shall possess the double: everlasting joy shall be upon them: all that see them shall acknowledge them, that they are the seed which the Lord hath blessed," Isa. lxi, 7, 9. Now, the seed which the Lord hath blessed is not the *natural* seed of Abraham: not to them belongs everlasting joy; or, if it does, the saints possess it with them, and that not in this world's Jerusalem, but in the New Jerusalem. Ezekiel describes the city with much particularity, and calls it "THE LORD IS THERE." Waters flow from its temple in a swelling stream, which heals the waters of the sea: "and every thing shall live whither the river cometh," Ezek. xlvii, 9. Trees of fruit for food, and leaves for medicine, bearing monthly, grow on either side of the river, and it is the city and country into which Messiah will lead his restored people, and rule over them there for ever. It



appears to be the same city, river of life, fruitful banks, and blessed country, that John describes in the last chapter of Revelation. "The hope of Israel" is the hope of all the spiritual seed, both Jew and Christian, to attain to the promised land, which appears to be the same heavenly country where Messiah is their King for ever. He will gather them from the land of their dispersion and captivity, and will lead them to a state of eternal rest and blessedness, in that world of which the great Creator says, "Behold, I make all things new." This is the hope of Israel, even

*Their restoration.*

Magnificent descriptions of this are repeatedly given in the prophets, too resplendent for this present evil world. All the terrors of the Lord's person are arrayed against the enemies of the holy people; he comes with power and great glory; he takes vengeance on all that oppress them; he leads them manifestly; he rules them personally; he plants them in their own land, and they shall no more be pulled up out of their land: the sinful kingdom he will destroy from off the face of the earth; evil doers he will cut off; the thing that hurts, defiles, or makes a lie, shall not be in his kingdom; but "*thy people shall be all righteous*,"—every one. Isa. lx, 21; iv, 3; Rev. xxi, 27.

If the carnal Jews must have a restoration in order to fulfil the Scriptures, it is apparent that the restoration of which the prophets delight to speak embraces all the chosen and faithful in Christ; and any peculiar promise to the carnal Jews, compared to the literal promise of the resurrection, is no better than a pine torch compared to the sun: suitable for a type, and withal a most useful and necessary thing to guide the traveler in a land of darkness: but when the sun is once risen, the pine torch is no longer of use; it is a troublesome incumbrance, and every wise traveler will dispense with it. The almighty and blessed God is able to drown the world, and to save one family; is able to burn the world, and to save one nation; is able to destroy all the kingdoms of the world, save only the natural Jews—and they are very confident he will do it. "Lo, I will save *thee* from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; for I am with thee, saith the Lord, to save *thee*; though I make a full end of all nations whither I have scattered thee, yet will I not make a full end of *thee*," Jer. xxx, 11. Intimations of this sort abound in the prophets; and if the natural Jews are "the holy people," the Gentiles are "the sinful kingdom;" and if the Jews have a restoration in the blood of old Adam, the Gentiles may never see it: the return of the

Jews is the signal for the extermination of all other nations; and our carnal race is sealed with the stamp of death, so sure as their carnal race is sealed with the stamp of an *everlasting* inheritance in this *transitory world*. But it is impossible to our view, that they should have an *eternal* inheritance in this world of mortality, whose heavens and earth pass away. Taking their restoration to be "the hope of Israel," as doubtless it is, the New Testament reconciles all difficulty, by showing this promised restoration to be the resurrection of the dead in Christ. This is the restitution of Israel and "of all things, which God has spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began," Acts iii, 21. This is the hope of Israel, for which creation waits with groans and travailing pains; to wit, "the redemption of our body," Rom. viii, 23, "in Jesus and the resurrection."

*The time of the true Israel's restoration.*

The Old and New Testaments harmonize on this point, as they do on the others preceding. Their language is different, as becomes *independent* witnesses: but the fact is made out by both alike, as becomes *faithful* witnesses. The time is, "when God shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you," Acts iii, 20. "The day of the Lord's vengeance, and the year of recompences for the controversy of Zion," Isa. xxxiv, 8. It is when "he will utterly destroy in this mountain the face of the covering cast over all people, and the veil that is spread over all nations: he will swallow up death in victory: and the Lord God will wipe away tears from off all faces; and the rebuke of his people shall he take away from off all the earth, for the Lord hath spoken it. And it shall be said in that day, Lo, this is our God; we have waited for him, and he will save us: this is the Lord; we have waited for him, we will be glad and rejoice in his salvation," Isa. xxv, 7. This wonderful passage portrays "the hope of Israel,"—"a feast of fat things, a feast of wines on the lees well refined."

In 2 Cor. iii, 16, the Holy Spirit assures us "the veil is done away in Christ," and "the veil shall be taken away" from the Jews. In Heb. x, 20, "the veil" is expressly declared to be "the flesh," which veil was manifestly done away in Christ, by his resurrection: and the same veil will he remove away from the Jews, and from covering the face of all nations, when "*he will swallow up death in victory*:" that is, in the resurrection of the dead. 1 Cor. xv, 54. Then, and not before the resurrection, the Lord God wipes away tears from off all faces, and the rebuke of *his people*

he takes away from off all the earth; and "the ransomed of the Lord," (they are his people, ransomed with his precious blood,) "the ransomed of the Lord shall return, and come to Zion with songs, and everlasting joy shall be upon their heads; and they shall obtain joy and gladness, and sorrow and sighing shall flee away," Isa. xxxv, 10. This is the hope of Israel: "Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither have entered into the heart of man, the things which God hath prepared for them that love him," 1 Cor. ii, 9.

In Daniel xii, 2, it is written, "At that time (the time of the restoration) shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for *the children of thy people*; and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation, even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book: and many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."—The Jew understands this *deliverance* and this resurrection to belong wholly to his own people, and the scene to be laid in this world, where Daniel and the holy dead are to stand in their lot among the restored of Israel in Palestine: on the contrary, the Christian understands by the people who are delivered, all believers in Jesus Christ; and the scene of their deliverance is the end of the world, when the judgment will sit, and the books be opened, and Daniel, with the holy dead out of every kindred and nation, will sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven. The time in these two interpretations concurs in the coming of Messiah in glory: and the difference lies in the carnal and exclusive spirit of Judaism on one side, and the universal and heavenly spirit of Christianity on the other. The former takes hold of this natural world and natural heart; the latter discards this world, and requires a new creation, to fit the holy people to see God and to enjoy him for ever. Jews and Christians agree in this Deliverer, that he is Messiah: and in the time of his deliverance, that it is at his coming: but they differ in their name of the Messiah, and also of the subjects of this deliverance; save that he is *Messiah*, and *Israel* are his people.

The almanac-maker sets out the four seasons of the year in their order, and describes their character, that men may note the progress of time, and prepare for winter. So Daniel the prophet has noted the progress of time in four divisions of the world's great year, from his day to the end of time, when "many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake." Four great monarchies give



their names to the four prophetic seasons : and the last of the four has three grand divisions, marked in Daniel's image, and noted in the book, that men may take warning : these three divisions are known by the legs of iron, the feet of iron and clay, and the subdivision of the toes. Similar divisions are noted in the life of the fourth beast by his time without horns, his time with ten horns, and his time while one horn came up among the ten, displacing three, and ruling over the residue unto the end. Christians and Jews agree that we are living in the last division of the fourth season of the great year of prophecy, and have run ten or twelve hundred years toward the end of that : but men do not take warning : the world does not regard it. Because the time is mercifully prolonged, it were folly to conclude it has no end. And what follows the last term of the fourth monarchy, and the last season of prophetic times ? Is it a *Jewish* monarchy in the blood of old Adam ? Is it a kingdom of the *carnal* Israel ? Is it an empire of *mortals* ? Read Daniel vii, 7, to the end, and see if the coming of the King of the fifth monarchy is not like unto him described by Enoch, the seventh from Adam, accompanied by myriads of saints, to execute judgment upon all the ungodly for all their ungodly deeds. See if there be any limit to that empire, whose King will have "dominion and glory, and a kingdom that all people, and nations, and languages shall serve him." Mark, and see whether it is the carnal Jews, or "the saints of the Most High, shall take the kingdom and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever." And consider whether time and this world will endure long enough for such an empire !—See, when "the judgment shall sit," whose kingdom they shall take away, "to consume and to destroy it unto the end ;" whether it is any dominion now upon the face of the earth, and the name of it. And whether the succeeding one is not given to an immortal race, even "to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him."

As a man, he is of the seed of Abraham and David ; and he is "the King of the Jews," crucified with mockery and derision in this world, but having an eternal throne of power and great glory in the world to come. Before Pontius Pilate he witnessed a good confession, (1 Tim. vi, 13,) to wit, "Thou sayest that I am a King ; to this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness of the truth," John xviii, 37. That truth is : He is the King, not of the Jews only, but of all in every nation who believe on his name. His kingdom is not of this world, or of time ; but of the celestial world to come, where lies the city and



country which Abraham sought; and into which "the hope of Israel" is to enter in the resurrection of the dead. This appears to be the testimony of Jesus, and the spirit of prophecy: this is the gospel of Christ, and of the kingdom of heaven. This is the promise made in Eden, The woman's seed shall bruise the serpent's head: and the promise made to Abraham, That he should be the heir of the world. This is the end of the law, and the perfection of grace, "Jesus and the resurrection."

*The astronomer could never devise the solar system.*

It was a full match for the highest human skill to discern and to demonstrate the laws which govern the various motions of the heavenly bodies: nor could the theologian invent this perfect fitness of the Jewish and Christian economy in all their prominent parts; it is enough for man to discern and to demonstrate it; to admire and to adore the heavenly hand which wrought the work, and gave it to the world. We have briefly sketched some of its outline, which volumes cannot fill; and the harmony of the parts is good witness to the perfection of the whole scheme. No frame ever came together with less hammering, each tenon to its mortise. The ingenuity of the wood-carrier did not invent so glorious a device; but only the divine Master who framed the universe, and prepared the plan of salvation, and gave to each part its due proportion, and its living form: to his name be all the praise.—The law of gravitation is not more universal in the material world than the testimony of Jesus in the prophecies: and the apparent motions of the heavenly bodies conflict with the law of gravitation, even as the apparent return of the Jews conflicts with the constant "looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God:" but astronomy does not open to the natural eye a more beautiful exhibition of divine wisdom, benevolence, power, and love, in the exact movements and changes of the starry frame, than revelation unfolds to the eye of faith in the harmony, and precise accord of the promises, the prophecies, and the gospel, in the testimony of Jesus and the resurrection. Some of the stars *appear* to stop and to retrace their course; some *appear* to start out of their places and fall to the earth; and a great majority to encircle the earth, immovably fixed: but it is demonstrated that these contrarieties of appearance are the necessary result of one uniform law of gravitation, and they owe their being, not to any exemption from that law, but solely to the relative positions of the beholder and of the luminaries. So, promises in the Bible *seem* greatly to conflict one with another, and some to fail altogether, and others to make no pro-

gress toward a consummation ; while to the well-instructed they open a luminous system of glorious holiness, perfect order, and illimitable extent, and it is demonstrated of nearly all that no contradictions exist ; but all are consistent in JESUS, and will be consummated in the resurrection of the dead.

*Remarks on the practical influence of this doctrine.*

The interpretation of the promises to Israel in favor of the natural Jews is proper Judaism, which is, and ever was a national, sectional, temporal, proud, selfish, and unchristian form of doctrine. From Constantine to Napoleon, from the mission of Paul and Barnabas, to inquire of the apostles and elders about this same *doctrine of Judaism*, to this day, it has been the source of "no small dissension and disputation," whether any but the circumcised can inherit the promise made of God unto the fathers. "Some which went out from us have troubled you with words ; subverting your souls, saying, Ye must be circumcised and keep the law ; to whom we gave no such commandment," Acts xv, 24. Our Judaizers trouble the church with the leaven of the same doctrine. They do not enjoin circumcision ; they repudiate it ; but, at the same time, they admit it to be a most salutary ordinance ; for, while it is nothing worth, separate from Christian baptism, *joined with that* it is a great thing, giving the subjects of this rite the sure prospect of high pre-eminence among their Christian brethren whose circumcision is of the heart only, even entitling them and their circumcised offspring to all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the rising empire of Judaism for ever, over and above the privileges of Gentile Christians. This is the spirit of the doctrine, if we understand it. It teaches that the Jews are a superior people ; that they have loftier claims to the divine favor ; that they have peculiar and valuable promises, not common to the Gentiles ; and that they have very flattering hopes and prospects *in this world*, even the universal dominion of it—all others being vassals of the circumcised.

It is worth while for *worldly* Christians to inquire the way for them and their offspring, to inherit a share of the honors of the Jewish empire to come ; especially since the times of the Gentiles seem to be almost accomplished, and the times of the Jews ready to begin. It is no small benefit for a *worldling* to gain, by adding to his Christian profession that of Judaism, and keeping what he can of the law of Moses. He need not have a Jewish father or mother to entitle him to inherit the Jews' promises. It is probably enough for him to make an honest profession of Judaism, put the

bloody seal to the covenant, abstain from certain meats, keep sabbath on Saturday, and he may go forth in all the pride of the Jews' prospects, and in the confidence of being an heir of Abraham with "certain which trusted in themselves that they were righteous, and despised others." (See the parable of the Pharisee and publican, Luke xviii, 9.) If the convert should not himself live to go up to Jerusalem, and have dominion there, his children may; and their interests should not be neglected. Even the children of Edomites and of Egyptians were allowed to enter the congregation in the third generation; and that is one which soon comes on. Deut. xxiii, 3. "And when a stranger shall sojourn with thee, and will keep the passover to the Lord, let all his males be circumcised—and then let him come near and keep it, and he shall be as one born in the land," Exod. xii, 48.

This seems to be the spirit of Judaism, a self-righteous doctrine, which lifts up itself against the cross of Christ in this world, and proffers to its followers a crown; a carnal doctrine, which counts the riches of faith too poor, and seizes on pottage with the appetite of Esau; which lightly esteems the blood of Christ, by which those are made nigh who were afar off; a doctrine that does not honor him who broke down the middle wall of partition, and introduced strangers and aliens into the commonwealth of Israel, making foreigners to become "fellow-citizens with the saints, and of the household of God," Eph. ii, 19; for it implies that Jesus our Lord *would* have done this, he *would* have made them fellow-citizens, of equal rights with the saints; but the Jews' promises are a main part of the wall not yet broken down; the Jews' promises still separate them, and make them an aristocracy in the church; make them lords, rather than fellow-citizens in Christendom. Judaism yields something to Christ, and something to his baptized church among the Gentiles; it does not mean to rob them; but it has something more, and, if any thing, better for the circumcised church. It allows the Gentiles to be "fellow-heirs and of the same body," but not exactly "partakers" of the same promises "in Christ by the gospel;" or, if of the same promises "*in Christ*," then the doctrine offers the Jews some promise *out of Christ*, which is not common to the Gentiles.

Either the natural Jews have promises peculiar to themselves, or they have not. If they have not, we are all fellow-citizens on a level. If they have promises peculiar to themselves, as a nation, those promises are in Christ seemingly; which would destroy their Jewish peculiarity, and open them to all Christians alike; or those promises are not in Christ, and then a Christian will never envy



them to a Jew, or to any other ; but to his brethren, who cherish unchristian hopes for the Jews, he may exclaim with the apostle, "O foolish Galatians, (Judaizers,) who hath bewitched you, that ye should not obey the truth, before whose eyes Jesus Christ was evidently set forth crucified among you ? Are ye so foolish ? having begun in the spirit, are ye now made perfect by the flesh ? Know ye, therefore, that they which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham. There is neither *Jew* nor *Greek*, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female ; for ye are all *one* in Christ Jesus. And if ye be Christ's, then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise," Gal. iii. From the first promise in the Bible of bruising the serpent's head, to the last, "Behold, I come quickly," all the prophets testify of the restitution and of the glorious reign of Christ over his restored and chosen people, in a world without end, which is a world to come, "the land of the living and not of the dead ;" and notwithstanding these prophecies were revealed to Jews, and are always understood by them to belong only to their nation ; Christians know that the same is the gospel of the kingdom of our Lord Jesus Christ, preached unto all nations ; and that it will be fulfilled, not to the natural Jews in this world, but unto all them that believe in the kingdom of heaven.

The practical influence of the interpretation, which explains the law and the prophets in the light of the resurrection, is spiritual, personal, and strictly conformable to the *discipline* of our Father in heaven. His providence and his word agree to warn and to instruct us, that in this world his people "shall have tribulation ;" neither a certain dwelling place, nor abiding crown, nor treasure that is secure against corruption and thieves, nor friend invincible to pain and death, nor hope of an eternal inheritance beneath the sun. Holy writ and daily experience unite to teach us, "The fashion of this world passeth away," 1 Cor. vii, 31. The faithful and true Witness assures us, "Heaven and earth shall pass away," Matt. xxiv, 35. And the Holy Spirit by the apostle demands, "Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be, in all holy conversation and godliness, looking for and hasting unto the coming of the day of God, wherein the heavens being on fire shall be dissolved, and the elements shall melt with fervent heat," 2 Pet. iii, 11, 12. The Scriptures give Israel hope in his death, that he shall live again ; and hope of new heavens and a new earth, when these heavens and earth pass away : but they forbid, and experience forbids, any sure and abiding hope on this side of the grave ; unless the promises to the Jews form an

exception ; and, if they do, we have no part in them ; the exception extends not to us Gentiles, unless we, "having begun in the Spirit," are now ready to be "made perfect" by the circumcision of the flesh—which is foolishness.

The holy soul loathes the doctrine of a temporal, carnal, earthly crown, the same which Satan in the temptation offered to Jesus our Lord. The holy soul loathes the doctrine of respect of persons, and of the circumcision. The holy soul turns away from the love of all this world can give, and delights in the testimony of Jesus, "the hope of Israel," and the love of heaven. In this view of divine revelation, we are ready to exclaim with Mary, "My soul doth magnify the Lord, and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour," Luke i, 46 ; who extends to us his holy covenant, "the oath which he sware to our father Abraham, that he would grant unto us," says Zacharias, "that we, being delivered out of the hand of our enemies, might serve him without fear," Luke i, 73. In him is the hope of Israel ; in him is the resurrection of the dead ; in him is the promise to Abraham and his seed made free to all believers. In him is the law fulfilled ; in him the prophecies centre ; in him the Jews are to be gathered ; in him the "chosen generation" are to be restored, when he swallows up death in victory. In him the partition wall is thrown down ; the veil of the temple is rent ; *the veil of the flesh is taken away* ; mortality is swallowed up of life. In him his people are all one Israel, as the rays of the sun are one : the very least of them contains all the primitive colors, together with the magnetic and caloric properties common to the sun. In him is the faith of Israel, during all their journey through this wilderness of trial ; in him they catch from Pisgah sometimes a distant view of the holy land ; in him they go over Jordan dry shod ; in him they come to their everlasting inheritance : "Come, ye blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world." Think you it was never *promised* them, so long prepared ? And to whom was it promised ? To ISRAEL, who have the oracles of God, who keep the faith, who have crucified the flesh with its lusts, and are dead to this world ; but, in the resurrection with Jesus, are gathered from their dispersions, and endowed with the promised inheritance of the holy land in eternal life, and in the holy city : "THE LORD IS THERE," which Abraham sought ; the New Jerusalem which John saw, where God will tabernacle with men : "And he will dwell with them, and they shall be his people, and God himself shall be with them, and be their God ; and God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes, and there shall be no more death, neither

sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain," Rev. xxi, 3, 4.

This is "the hope of Israel:" is it not also a faithful interpretation of the Scripture doctrine of the return of the Jews? Surely, they shall inherit the holy land for ever.

Child of Adam, "son of God," shun the example of profane Esau, who indulged his appetite at the price of his birthright. Lay hold of eternal life. Sanctify your body, and expect your birthright in the resurrection of the dead. Of this inheritance no earthly father, though a rich Jew, can endow his offspring; no base father, though a poor slave, can deprive them. All its heirs cry in the spirit unto God: "Doubtless, thou art our Father, though Abraham be ignorant of us, and Israel acknowledge us not," Isa. lxiii, 16. "And a great multitude, which no man could number, of *all nations, and kindreds, and people, and tongues*, stood before the throne, and before the Lamb, clothed with white robes, and palms in their hands, and cried with a loud voice, saying, Salvation to our God, which sitteth upon the throne, and unto the Lamb. Amen: blessing, and glory, and wisdom, and thanksgiving, and honor, and power, and might, be unto our God for ever and ever. Amen." Rev. vii, 9, 10, 12.

H. D. W.

New-York, December 18, 1841.

---

ART. III.—*Prize Essays on a Congress of Nations, for the Adjustment of International Disputes, and for the Promotion of Universal Peace without resort to Arms; together with a sixth Essay, comprising the Substance of the Rejected Essays.* Pp. 700. Boston: published by Whipple & Damrell, for the American Peace Society. 1840.

IN 1828 the American Peace Society was organized at New-York. Similar associations exist in the principal countries of Europe. Their object is "permanent peace by persuasion, not by force." "Universal peace without resort to arms." This has, a thousand times, been called Utopian, is still called so, and doubtless will be for some time to come. It may be so regarded by some, whose attention may be turned to the subject by this article. But we ask such to give the subject an examination. We ask them but to read the publications of the American Peace Society, and we believe they will espouse its cause. The peace cause, however, is not alone in being regarded Utopian. Indeed,



there is scarcely a philanthropic or benevolent enterprise of the present age that has not been so regarded. So have the Bible and missionary enterprises been considered by many, and still are by some. But the friends of these enterprises know that this does not render them so; though, to their regret, they are aware that they are retarded just in proportion as they are so considered, inasmuch as those, who look upon them as ideal, are restrained from acting in their favor. The friends of religion believe that the gospel is destined to be preached among all people, that the church is to be instrumental in this work, and that it is now gloriously in the way of being accomplished by missionary movements. They believe that the Bible is destined to be read in every language, and they are making efforts with a fair prospect of bringing it to pass, before many years more shall pass away. The friends of religion and humanity have long mourned over the widespread and destructive ravages of intemperance; but they have eventually discovered that there is a way by which the evil, great and extensive as it is, may be overcome; and their efforts to accomplish this great work have been crowned with most encouraging success. So has it been with other philanthropic enterprises that might be mentioned. The friends of religion, of humanity, and of peace, have long mourned over the dismal ravages of war, but only of late have they discovered—from what they have seen of the success that has attended other benevolent enterprises—that wars may be terminated, and lasting, universal peace established. And further, they are of the sentiment that this is destined to take place, and that man is to be instrumental in this work. While they believe that the gospel of peace is to be “preached in all the world,” and “the mountain of the Lord’s house established in the top of the mountains, and all nations flow unto it,” they believe, also, that the time shall come when “nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.” Any one, who carefully examines the subject, must, as we think, come to the conclusion, that not one of the objects contemplated in the great moral enterprises of the present day is more feasible than that with reference to which the friends of peace are laboring.

They rely, for the furtherance of their cause, on the dissemination of light; and expect as this shall be done, that the attention of men will be secured, their minds informed, their sentiments corrected, and public opinion, “the queen of the world,” turn in their favor. When this shall be fully accomplished, the work is done; for, in this age of the world, when power and government are

falling, where they should, into the hands of the people, public opinion is only to demand the accomplishment of any work, and it is done. In the dissemination of light, they regard themselves as aided by every other moral movement ; particularly by the spread of the Bible, the gospel, and liberal principles. They regard the various religious and benevolent movements of the present day as mutual helps to each other. Such they truly are, and he who takes an enlarged view of things, rejoices at the progress of any and all of these. And every friend of humanity must rejoice to know that there is a portion of the human race whose thoughts are turned on peace, on permanent, universal peace. That their object is good, all must acknowledge. Whether they shall be able to accomplish it, we know is doubted. But with the blessing of Heaven, it is believed, their object will eventually be accomplished. For the purpose of contributing to this end, the American Peace Society has issued the work under consideration. The following is the history of its origin, as condensed from the preface.

A congress of nations has been a favorite plan with the American Peace Society, ever since its first organization. Two gentlemen of New-York, in the year 1831, offered five hundred dollars for the best essay on a congress of nations, and one hundred for the second best ; and the Hon. Joseph Story, William Wirt, and John M'Lean were appointed as the committee to award the premium. About forty essays were handed in for this prize. The committee of award could not agree on any one of the essays as superior to the others, but recommended that the premium should be divided among five of the best, which they designated. The gentlemen who offered the premium rejected this plan, and raised the premium to one thousand dollars for the best essay only, and appointed the Hon. John Quincy Adams, Chancellor Kent, and Thomas S. Grimke, the committee of award. Mr. Grimke having died before the essays were examined, the Hon. Daniel Webster consented to take his place. But the second committee were no more successful than the first, and separated without coming to any agreement. After this the society authorized its president, together with such other persons as he should choose out of the executive committee, to select five of the best essays to be published in a volume, together with a sixth essay, composed by the president, and containing all the matter relevant to the subject which was elicited by the rejected essays.

It is expressed in the preface as the intention of the American Peace Society in publishing the work "to present a copy of it to the president of the United States, the heads of departments, the

governors of every state in the Union, to every foreign ambassador in Washington, to every crowned head in Europe, and to the executive of every republic in America." This has already been done. The work has been favorably received, even among the crowned heads of Europe, from some of whom encouraging answers have been given. But the work was not designed alone as a present to the leading spirits of the age; but also as a means of diffusing light among the generality of men, and of turning their attention to the great plan proposed in it.

It is an octavo volume of seven hundred pages, got up in the first style. The paper is of the fairest quality. The type is large and open; and the impression admirable. As to the style, it is such as we should expect the style of the ablest and best writers to be on a momentous and fruitful subject. The work, throughout, is fraught with important matter, and the information belonging alone to either essay is sufficient to compensate for the expense of the purchase.

The first essay, in the order of the volume, may be regarded, principally, as introductory to its leading subject, rather than as a full dissertation upon it. In endeavoring to give some idea of this essay, we shall principally use the author's own words, as given in a brief recapitulation at the close. In the outset he has "endeavored to show the reasonableness of the expectation that wars shall eventually cease; that their frequency may, at no distant period, be greatly diminished; and that the friends of peace are thus furnished with a broad and solid basis of good sense and sound philosophy, for their philanthropic efforts and expectations." He has "shown that the imagination of the poet has loved to dwell in the bright visions of a peaceful age; that philosophers have delighted to muse upon the theme of a race living together in harmony; and that the eye of the prophet, penetrating the veil of futurity, has discerned the advent of an era when men shall learn war no more." He has endeavored to prove, and we think has proved to the satisfaction of any one who carefully reads his essay, "that the very nature of man revolts at the evils of war; that his humanity recoils from the contemplation of its miseries and curses, and that his intellect denounces the scheme of warfare as one of gross prodigality—as an absurd mode of procuring security and quiet, and as the most fruitful source of political mischiefs." He has exhibited "a simple view of the rules of conduct and modes of intercourse, by which nations are now directed, in both peace and war;" and has made "manifest the superior advantages of a congress of nations for adjusting nice and



delicate points in national relations." He has then "considered in what manner the projected tribunal could be called into being;"—"what subjects shall come within its cognizance;"—"and what shall be the nature and extent of its powers, and the sanctions attached to its decisions." He has finally shown, by reference to history, "that the proposed international tribunal bears no resemblance, in constitution, powers, or purposes, to any of the councils, leagues, unions, alliances, or congresses of ancient or modern times, and is not, therefore, liable to any objections which may be made to them, but can be fairly advocated or assailed only on the abstract principles of expediency, justice, and humanity." The author closes with the following sentiment:—

"Whenever, in the course of human events, under the direction of a merciful and benignant Providence, a considerable number of the leading commercial states shall, by treaty stipulations, establish a commission for the compilation of a uniform system of international law, and thus remove, as between themselves, one fertile source of discord; and still more, whenever such nations shall covenant one with another, that in no case will any two of them have recourse to the bloody arbitrament of war, but will refer the decision of all exciting disputes to a congress of delegates chosen from the other associated powers, and composing either a standing and permanent board of arbitration, or a special and temporary commission—whenever that period shall arrive, the bright visions of prophetic philanthropy shall be more fully realized, and shine forth in living beauty before the eyes of a delighted world; then shall the strong and figurative language of Isaiah become familiar and true as household words; and then shall the 'golden era' of the poets return under the auspices, not of a heathen Saturn—a fabulous divinity—but of that Saviour, Christ the Lord, whose highest title is, 'PRINCE OF PEACE'—and whose advent was announced in Judea as the coming of 'peace on earth and good will to men.'"—P. 91.

The second essay is not without its faults. There is too much of obscurity, and somewhat of abruptness in the style; but its greatest fault is a want of arrangement, from which results considerable repetition. But if faults it has, it has more of excellences; and the reader will readily excuse the former while he contemplates the latter. The author has studied Burlamaqui, Vattel, and Martin, and has drawn largely from Azuni. This we learn from his fidelity in giving credit. He is, however, capable of thinking for himself, of thinking profoundly, and there is much valuable originality in this dissertation. There is also in it much of conciseness; owing to which, and the want of arrangement, it is difficult to give an abstract or synopsis of it, and do it justice.

In the commencement, in treating of the unlawfulness and injustice of war, the author uses the following language :—

“Neither in a moral nor a national point of view can war be lawful, except as being *indispensable* to acquire or defend some right, or redress some wrong. It must be unlawful to seek justice in the mere conflict of physical forces. Justice and violence are not consequences of each other, and as clearly have no connection authorizing an inference that national disputes can be rightly adjusted by force of arms. A common international tribunal of justice and equity is the new system proposed. This is to supply the place of war, which has been a system, in effect and in operation, of force—of chance—adverse to national and natural rights, and to none more than the right of *protection* of life and property. The choice between life and death, happiness and misery, is not more important than the choice between these repugnant systems.”—Page 98.

In a subsequent paragraph, a prophetic sentence, closely allied to what we have here inserted, seems incidentally to drop from his pen :—

“Contrary to reason—the law of nature and justice—the moral and divine laws—and the great interests of men and nations, it will cease, and its vain glory will soon perish with it.”

He meets the objection of novelty, urged against the proposed congress, and shows that all which is designed to be accomplished in it, or the greater part of it, is in the constant process of being accomplished in negotiations, arbitrations, mediations, congresses, and alliances. On this topic he remarks,—

“If it (the proposed congress) were entirely a novelty, it would not on that account appear inexpedient. We shall presently inquire how much and fast, of late years, *public opinion* has favored it. Besides, the objection of novelty, should it be pressed, does not attach to the institution, which substantially is nothing more than the *creation of an agent*; but rather to the civilized world, meriting as it does the reproach of not having *earlier* founded such an institution. This congress is in form only novel, but in principle it is an *improvement*, a term of marked significance in this ‘age of improvements.’”—P. 130.

The writer has an able paragraph on the “science of war,” “falsely so called,” and treats the matter with becoming severity. He shows that, “as a science, war is unlike every other science; in its influences, positively injurious; in its effects, absolutely destructive.”—P. 113.

Other topics of equal importance are treated in this essay which we cannot notice for want of space. For the same reason we must pass by many passages fraught with beauty and excellence, which we should be glad to insert.

The third essay, in order to be appreciated, must be read. Lest we may unduly prepossess the reader in its favor by our encomium, should we pass any upon it, we will insert the following from the preface :—

“The third essay is very beautiful in its language, and its style is perspicuous ; but it does not enter deeply into the subject of a congress of nations, nor take so practical a view of it as is desirable ; there is too much of a general nature in it. There is also in it some confusion of ideas on the subject of adjudication. This must ever be the case with all those who make no distinction between the legislative and judicial functions of a congress and court of nations.”\*

In the beginning of his dissertation, the writer confines his investigations

“to the modern nations of Europe, and to the changes which have therein taken place since the earliest period of their known history. We have done thus because we have more authentic and minute accounts of those changes, and because the history of one nation in these particulars is the history of mankind. Without proceeding further, therefore, we may safely conclude that there is some innate principle of the human constitution drawing us into a state of peace, and friendship, and social order, and inducing a consequent acquiescence in wholesome legal restraint, whenever this can be done without submitting to encroachment and indignity, but never otherwise.”

The author here goes in opposition to the sentiment of Cicero, that “war is the natural state of man,”† and labors to show, “that a state of friendship and social union is the great governing desire of the whole human family,” and proceeds to prove that “this *desire* has not been answered because other principles” (some of which he enumerates) “have, heretofore, in a great degree counteracted the effect of this pacific propensity.” This sentiment will appear novel to some, and be doubted by many ; but the reasonableness of it will appear to any one on reading the essay and retrospecting the annals of history. It will be seen, to be sure, that the world has ever been a theatre of war and bloodshed ; but it will also be seen, that it has been steadily approximating “a state of peace, and friendship, and social order.” To show this is one of the leading designs of the writer. In doing which he goes back to the earliest times reached by authentic history, and shows how, from the marriage contract, and the organization of families, there first arose clans and tribes ; how they became blended and enlarged by unions and conquests ; and how, in the process of

\* This distinction is clearly made in the sixth essay.

† Cicero, *Oratio pro P. Sextio*, cap. 42.



centuries, these separate and belligerent bodies politic became consolidated and formed into the ancient Oriental empires. From these early times he carries the reader on to Greece, to Rome, to feudal times. He glances, in an expressive manner, at the history of the principal nations that have figured on the theatre of the world, and shows that mankind have ever been tending to a state of permanent, universal tranquillity. After tracing the progress of civilization among individuals and smaller communities, he follows up the steps by which they have advanced to a species of conventional civil government, and remarks as follows respecting the mutual dependence and present regulations of the intercourse of nations :—

“They have already, though perhaps unconsciously, formed a species of social compact, which is almost matured into an effectual civil government. They have abolished the most glaring features of savage licentiousness; they have formed a federal republic; they have adopted a code of by-laws; they are provided with the means of enacting others; and they have the effective ability of enforcing all their regulations. We are now endeavoring to obtain the enactment of a great national statute, abolishing for ever a barbarous and bloody institution, and substituting a system founded on the principles of reason and humanity, at present professed by all the civilized nations of the earth.”—P. 243.

We now leave this essay and proceed to the fourth; in commendation of which nothing more need be said than that it was written by Thomas C. Upham, Professor of Mental and Moral Philosophy in Bowdoin College, Maine. Professor Upham's reputation as a writer will secure to his essay respectful attention. The essay is divided into eight chapters. In the first are given historical notices of the different councils or associations that have existed in the world, which bear some analogy to the plan proposed. In the second, he notices some of the objects that would engage the attention of such a council. The objects noticed are: inalienable rights; crimes against humanity; improvements in the law of nations; commercial intercourse; naturalization and allegiance; contracts in relation to different nations; majority, evidence, and law of domicile; retaliation; measures for the relief of suffering nations; interpretation of treaties; military regulations in time of peace; the entire and permanent extinction of war. The third is devoted to the consideration of weights and measures, and the fourth to that of the slave-trade. In the fifth the writer treats of the insufficiency of the present modes of national redress; in the sixth, objections to the proposed congress are considered;

in the seventh, circumstances favorable to its establishment are noticed; and the eighth closes with appropriate remarks.

Of the slave-trade the writer justly remarks, "If there is any discussion, in which the whole human race could properly be concerned, it is in relation to this insufferable traffic." Much appalling information is given on this subject. We have only room for the following:—

"It is not easy to state with perfect precision, but the average number of enslaved Africans, violently torn away each year from their native country, may be estimated with probability at not less than seventy-five thousand. Many persons, who have been favorably situated to form a correct estimate, have placed the number as high as one hundred thousand." "What king, what legislator, can be found who will not raise his voice against this horrid wickedness, till it shall reach all lands, all nations! *And yet this traffic, with all its dreadful attendants, has already measured a pilgrimage of more than three hundred years; it has already consigned to slavery and all the horrors of slavery, forty millions of persons; and still lives and flourishes.*"—Pp. 385, 387.

The essay thus concludes:—

"Let us indulge the inspiration of so great a theme. Let us place before us this universal parliament, which contains in itself the extract and the essence of the wisdom of all climes. And how gloriously it strikes upon the sense, and amplifies and fills the imagination! When the rude Gauls entered the city of Rome, and saw the venerable senators seated in silence to receive them, they were filled with admiration at the dignity of their appearance. They read, in their staid countenances and motionless lips, and marble brows, a stern integrity, and a patriotic devotedness to their fallen country; and the hearts of the barbarians were strongly moved.

"But the congress of nations is not a silent assembly; it speaks to the sight, but it speaks to the ear also. And in what a voice! With what depths of research and learning! With what profound and harmonious eloquence! England sends her Fox and Pitt, her Cannings and Broughams; France, her Foys, and Manuals, and Constants; Prussia, her Hardenberg; regenerated Spain, her Arguelles; and our own beloved America, her Franklins and Jeffersons, her Madisons and Marshalls. Would not such an assembly command the attention of the world; that broad, deeply interested world, which they would have for their audience! Would not the voice of war, always ready to break out in threatenings and blood, grow silent at their frown! Would not wisdom emanate from their lips, which would enlighten the obscurities of public law, and spread effulgence over the too long perplexed and darkened pathway of nations! As in ancient times, distinct and powerful communities resorted to the senate of Rome for the settlement of their difficulties, we should now see nations, powerful in arts and in arms, resorting to them for their advice; but they would come

to a purer and more exalted tribunal. Their jarring differences are settled ; their drawn swords are returned to the scabbard ; and they go back to their hills and valleys, their vines and their fig-trees ; and beside the cool fountain and the overarching shade, and around the domestic hearth, no longer visited by sudden and cruel alarms, they celebrate the dominion of peace and the triumph of universal justice." —Pp. 425, 426.

No one of the essays ought, perhaps, to be more highly esteemed than the fifth. There may be too much of denunciation in some of its parts, and something eccentric in the style, in some places ; but its defects, if it has any, are few. We will endeavor to present the reader with a succinct digest of this essay, which can be done with tolerable ease, as it is written with clearness and arrangement. In the first place two propositions are established "on an immovable basis : " First, "That the most probable way of ascertaining which is the aggrieved party in an international, as well as in an individual dispute, is, to refer it to a third party." Secondly, "That nations, as well as individuals, being fallible and frail, can, consistently with true dignity, refer their disputes in this manner." Another point is then established, viz. : "That nations should not only refer their disputes to arbitration, but they should have a regularly organized tribunal for that and other kindred purposes." Then is discussed, with much ability, *the only real question* at issue, viz. : "Will mankind, depraved as they are, consent to such an arrangement?" The affirmative of this question is conclusively maintained. It is objected, the writer notices, that though mankind have gone so far in civilization, "that war still continues ; thus proving that the principle which has accomplished so much, is unequal to the task now proposed." This objection is swept away by considering some of the changes that have been wrought in the abolition of barbarous customs ; such changes as would lead us to expect the abolition of the custom of war.

After disposing of the question, whether mankind will ever consent to the proposed arrangement, the writer shows the practicability of it, and the manner in which it may be commenced. Objections are considered ; and it is shown in what manner the decisions of this congress may be enforced ; and it is conclusively shown, that "the want of a plausible excuse" to do otherwise than observe them, in other words, "*the point of honor*," (the same principle that in most cases moves to war,) would in most, if not all cases, insure their enforcement. Then are considered the law of nature, the customs of nations, public opinion, and the improvement of nations in these respects. It is shown that war is not



only unchristian, but unworthy of civilized men; and that as civilization and true Christianity advance, war must decrease, and some pacific tribunal for the settlement of international disputes be instituted in its place. As it draws toward a close, the essay makes some powerful appeals to Christians, to philanthropists, and to men; and denounces war in terms too severe, perhaps, (though it tells nothing but the truth,) to render it the most useful to some for whom the work was designed. A single extract and we are done with this essay:—

“No wonder that the Messiah is called the Prince of peace. No wonder that it was predicted as the distinguishing blessing that was to signalize his reign, that ‘nations should learn war no more.’ How could the benign character of his religion be better represented than by showing that it was calculated to overthrow this hydra evil? Thrice blessed gospel! by thy hallowed influence all these commotions, all these heart-burnings, all these divisions and contentions, shall end; man stand erect in the enjoyment of his unshackled rights, and roam unrestricted to the ends of the earth; nation commingle with nation, divested of jealousy, rivalry, and prejudice, their interests no longer conflicting; and the whole race of men constitute one general brotherhood, one immense and happy community!

“Shall these blessed anticipations be realized? What prevents? Where is the friend of human kind that will not do what in him lies to produce this glorious consummation? And where the wretch who, for pelf or fame, for obstinacy or revenge, would dare throw obstacles in the way? Breathes there so vile a recreant the air of Heaven? Or if, indeed, such wretches can be found, will men permit them thus to do?

‘War is a game,  
Which, were the people wise,  
Kings would not play at.’

Heaven knows it to be a wanton, wicked waste of life. Heaven knows that, unless made the last resort, in reality it is murder—wholesale murder. And Heaven, too, knows, that it cannot be called the last resort, till the plan which we propose shall at least have been proved impracticable, by a fair and an honest trial.”—P. 505.

We have now noticed the prize essays. The sixth was written by the late and much lamented William Ladd, Esq., president of the American Peace Society, than whom no one was more capable of writing on this subject. His mind, cast by nature in one of the finest molds, was, in early life, highly cultivated by a liberal education, afterward extensively stored with valuable reading, and treasured with useful and extensive knowledge of a commercial and national kind, from following a maritime life. He finally settled down in independent circumstances, and turned his attention to the cause of peace, which engrossed his mind, almost ex-

clusively, for the last twenty years of his life. For its promotion he has given profusely from his purse, and traveled and lectured extensively.\* Together with some other leading spirits in the enterprise, he was instrumental in getting the subject before several of the state legislatures, and also before congress. The cause has not been much noticed in the leading papers, either political or religious; nor has it engaged the attention of many of the leaders, comparatively speaking, in either church or state; yet it has several times been brought before the Massachusetts legislature, by which body it has been favorably noticed and encouragingly reported on. It has also been brought before other state legislatures. Twice, or more, it has come before congress by way of petition, and one long and very able report has been made on the subject before the House of Representatives by the committee on foreign relations.

In his preface Mr. Ladd remarks,—

“The author has endeavored to comprise all the thoughts on a congress of nations contained in the rejected essays worth preserving. He differs from all the other essays, either accepted or rejected, in dividing the subject into two parts, viz.: a congress of nations, for the purpose of settling the principles of international law; and a court of nations for the adjudication of cases submitted to it by the mutual consent of two or more contending nations. He has studied brevity, perspicuity, and arrangement, rather than a fine style of writing. His essay consists chiefly of a statement of facts, the general history of former attempts at a congress of nations, and of the peace enterprise in this country and in Europe, so far as it relates to a congress of nations, together with a copious appendix, containing many of the petitions to legislative bodies, and all their reports and resolves on them.”

Thus we have a condensed view of this essay in the author's own words. We will only add that he enters largely into the organization and practical operations of his proposed schemes. The appendix is of much value, containing, as it does, the arguments of petitions, and the thoughts of some of our first legislators on this subject, as given in their reports and resolves; and we have in them the sentiments of some who are not entirely in favor of the plan proposed, so that we have some of the reasons which may be presented on the other side of the question.

Some may suppose, perhaps, that there must be considerable repetition in these essays; but, though there be some, there is not so much as to be at all objectionable to the work. Should it

\* The last three years of his life he was a regular licensed minister of the Congregational denomination, and regularly preached on the subject.

be duly noticed and appreciated, the present edition would be speedily taken up and another called for. It should be in the hands of every enemy of war; and it may be recommended to them who are not such, if any of that class there be, as a book well worthy of their attention—as a book from which they may derive much valuable information, though it might have no effect in changing their sentiments. After all that is done; after these essays are published and circulated, and reviewed and read, there may be doubts in the minds of many, possibly in the minds of most people, as to the practicability of the projected scheme. Though this be so, the scheme receives the approval of many of the leading spirits of the age, and by some is advocated and urged. This is fully as much so as could be expected, considering its novelty. The distinguished Thomas S. Grimke, who died of cholera in 1834, was a full and decided friend of the peace cause, and we believe an advocate for a congress of nations. The Hon. John Quincy Adams, though he does not indorse all the principles of the American Peace Society, strongly advocates this plan; and it is believed that most of the leading men of this nation, and many of other nations, are its friends, and believe in its feasibility. The legislature of Massachusetts, a body distinguished for its wisdom, is decided and ardent in recommending measures for the promotion of peace and the establishment of a congress of nations. It is given as the opinion of the senate, in a report adopted by that body in 1837, that such a tribunal

*“is neither visionary in theory, unimportant in character, nor unattainable in result: but, on the contrary, is well deserving the countenance and cordial support of every friend to the stability of the social compact, the increase of national wealth, the advancement of civilization, the promotion of the arts and sciences, the extension of freedom, the security of constitutional government, the improvement of public morals, the extension of the Christian faith, and thus to the general welfare of mankind.”—Appendix, p. 651.*

But whatever may be the result of efforts for such an establishment, the efforts of peace men are not unavailing. It will be recollected that, within half a dozen years last past, there was some prospect of a war between the United States and Mexico. In 1837 petitions from some of the peace societies went up to congress, praying our government to accede to the proposition of the Mexican congress, viz., to submit the matters of dispute between the two nations to the decision of a friendly power. Ex-president Adams, in a letter to the corresponding secretary of the New-York Peace Society, declares that congress was indebted to those



petitions for the knowledge that this proposition had been made by Mexico; and, says he,—

“This removed all immediate danger of a war with Mexico; and if the petitioners of the peace societies had never rendered to their country any other service, they would have deserved the thanks of the whole nation for this.”—*Mr. Ladd's Essay*, p. 594.

The heaven is working. A change is evidently taking place in the minds of men on the subject of war; and there are plain indications among men that some *radical change*, from “brute force” to peaceful remedies, must ere long be effected. Pacific sentiments, measures, and results, are more prevalent than they have been in any former age of the world; and they are on the advance. France, to be sure, is armed, and a part of her population are madly clamoring for war; and some of the other nations of Europe have, of late, been increasing their military preparations, having, doubtless, been moved to it by the more than ordinary belligerent attitude which France has of late assumed. But the almost universal peace which prevails shows conclusively, that the thoughts of the governing portion of mankind are averse to war; and this further appears from the fact, that there is, of late, little blood shed in the collisions of nations, compared with what there used to be, and in that wars are of comparatively short duration. This has been the case in all the wars in which Christian or civilized nations have recently been concerned. The happy age, which prophets have predicted, and of which poets have sung, seems to be at hand, an age in which our world shall cease to be

“One wide extended field of blood,  
Where men like fiends each other tear,  
In all the hellish rage of war.”

These essays, it is hoped, will contribute something toward the establishment of a congress of nations. But should they not; should one never be established, they will, doubtless, help in diffusing pacific sentiments. The following is the opinion of John Quincy Adams, as expressed in a letter to the president of the American Peace Society:—“The publication of the five dissertations, and the distribution of them among the princes and rulers of nations, will awake and keep alive the attention both of Europe and America to the subject.” Ought not, will not, every friend of religion, every lover of mankind, lend a helping hand to this cause? May we not hope that “the great family of nations,” as expressed in the report from which we have before quoted, “shall yet meet in a friendly council—an august assembly!—to consult together

for the common good, to promote the general welfare of mankind, to cause the sword to be sheathed, the bayonet to be unfixed, and to bid the iron-tongued artillery no longer cause the nations to quake before its thunder. Not that peace men contemplate the total discharge of navies, the entire dismantling of forts, the immediate disbanding of militia. The sword of justice must be uplifted still. The armed police of nations must remain on the alert. The court-room does not supersede the necessity of the watch-house. Yet the trial by jury has superseded, and may well supplant the trial by combat; and arbitration, or a court of nations, may be made the final resort instead of an appeal to arms."

*Nassau, New-York, 1841.*

---

ART. IV.—*The Life of Wiclif.* By CHARLES WEBB LE BAS, M. A., Professor in the East India College, Herts; and late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. 18mo., pp. 395. New-York: Harper & Brothers. 1832.

THOUGH the name of Wiclif is well known to the student of ecclesiastical history, yet the important part he took in the grand work of the Reformation is not generally understood. His life, to be sure, has been written by *Lewis* and *Vaughan*, and more recently by *Le Bas*, but it seems not to have attracted that attention which the importance of the subject would appear to demand. Mosheim also notices Wiclif in a very cursory manner, without attributing to him the merit which he deserves as a pioneer in the great work of purifying the church from its defilements. This defect in Mosheim, his translator, Murdock, has attempted to supply by giving in a copious note the outlines of his character, of his labors and sufferings in the cause of his divine Master.

To *Charles Webb Le Bas*, however, we are indebted for a very full and satisfactory account of this holy and intrepid man of God. It is, therefore, from this interesting piece of biography, published by the Harpers, as one of the series of their Theological Library, that we shall extract the principal facts in relation to the life, labors, and sufferings of Wiclif, as well as of the effects which he produced on society, referring to Mosheim for some items respecting the general state of the church at the time he made his appearance. It is, indeed, hardly possible for us, living as we do in the midst of so many high and distinguished blessings and privileges, to make a just estimate of the obstacles which were

thrown in the way of Wiclif—obstacles arising from the general corruption which prevailed among almost all orders and ranks of men, both in the church and state. To be convinced of this, let us take a brief review of the condition of things at the time he appeared upon the stage of action.

In the year 1378, after the death of *Gregory XI.*, the cardinals who formed the electoral college proclaimed *Bartholomew de Regnano* to be duly elected pontiff, who assumed the name of *Urban VI.* It is stated that they were driven to this measure by the clamors of the people of Rome, who, fearing that a Frenchman would be elected, who would continue the pontifical seat at *Avignon*, in France, with furious threats demanded that an Italian should be placed at the head of the church.

This new pontiff, by his uncourteous conduct, the severity of his temper, and his haughty demeanor, soon alienated the affections of all from him, and even the cardinals to whom he was indebted for his elevation became disgusted with his conduct. So intolerable was his tyranny, and pernicious his dissipations, that the cardinals withdrew to *Fondi*, a Neapolitan city, and there elected another pope, *Robert*, a count of Geneva, who assumed the name of *Clement VII.*, and, in order to quiet the people of Rome, alleged that *Urban* was elected only in pretence. Thus the Latin branch of the church was blessed, or cursed, with two heads at the same time, both, according to their own doctrine, infallible, though at open war with each other.

*Urban* continued at Rome, while *Clement* exercised his functions at *Avignon*, in France, and thus these rival pontiffs divided the patrimony of St. Peter between them and their respective followers. This constituted what has been called *the great schism of the west*. For during not less than fifty years the church had two or three heads, assailing each other with the utmost virulence, hurling at one another the thunders of excommunication, and the anathemas of St. Peter and all the holy apostles.

In this state of things, what could be expected other than that the church should become deluged with crime, while torn to pieces by such furious antagonists. Hence it is said by the historians of those days, that the clergy, before awfully corrupt, now laid aside even the appearance of piety and godliness, and rolled in luxury and licentiousness, while the people were thrown into perplexity and doubt.

Many fruitless attempts were made by kings, princes, bishops, and theologians, to heal the breach, and restore peace and union to the church. The schism, however, was continued; for on the



death of *Urban VI.*, which took place in 1389, the Italian cardinals, who had adhered to his interests, and still cleaving to their principles, elected for his successor at Rome *Peter Thomacelli*, a Neapolitan, distinguished as *Boniface IX.* And on the death of *Clement VII.*, in the year 1394, the French cardinals appointed as his successor *Peter de Luna*, a Spaniard, who took the name of *Benedict XIII.* Thus was the lust of dominion, the pride of office, and a haughty contempt of all rule and order, made the instruments of temporal aggrandizement, to the destruction of peace and harmony. All means failing to remove this scandal from the church, the French Church withdrew from the dominion of both the pontiffs, in a grand council held at Paris.

In the mean time the vices of that devouring army of ecclesiastics, called *monks*, arose to such a pitch, that even those wicked and debauched pontiffs, and more especially Clement, held them in abhorrence. So inveterate were they, that all labor to reform them proved vain. Yet such influence had they, more particularly the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans*, that every thing of much consequence was transacted under their supervision, both in ecclesiastical and civil courts, both in Rome and the cabinets of princes. The vast influence which these monks acquired on account of their apparent sanctity, caused the hatred of the higher and lower orders to become inflamed against them. Hence, they became the objects of general reproach, and various methods were resorted to to abridge their influence, and finally to put them down. In England, the university of Oxford resisted them manfully. But among all those who set themselves against these begging monks, none was more conspicuous than *John Wiclif*, nor was any better qualified for the task.

He was born near Richmond, in Yorkshire, about the year 1324, and received his education at Oxford, where he was a commoner in Queen's College, and afterward of Merton, in which he became a fellow. He early evinced a comprehensive mind, and applied himself to study with all his might, and became a profound scholar, more especially in philosophy, metaphysics, and theology.

Beholding the corruptions of the mendicant monks, their haughtiness, and the innovations they were making upon truth and righteousness, his spirit was stirred within him, and, in 1360, he distinguished himself by becoming the powerful advocate of the university against their infringements of its laws and usages. He was eminently qualified for this work. Possessing an intellect naturally strong and vigorous, acute and penetrating, and a mind expanded and disciplined by education, he saw through their

corrupt designs, and applied himself with admirable skill and assiduity to unveil the hypocrites before the world.

They writhed under the lashes of his pen and tongue, for he not only wrote against them, but also disputed with them publicly; but the more they winced and writhed, the more severe were his strokes; until finally the archbishop of Canterbury took up the cause against him, and ejected him from his wardenship; for such were his attainments and his celebrity, that he had been made master of Baliol College, and, four years after, warden of Canterbury Hall.

From this decision of the archbishop, Wiclif appealed to the pope, who, to give himself time for due deliberation on so grave a matter, delayed deciding for three years, during which time Wiclif continued his stripes upon the backs of the monks and the corrupt clergy, nor did he spare the pontiff in his animadversions. For this audacity he was made to feel the vengeance of pontifical hatred; for in 1370, Cardinal *Andruynus*, the papal commissioner, decided the cause against him, and deprived him of his office.

This stroke, however, by no means damped the ardor of his zeal, nor deprived him of the means of exemplifying it in opposition to the errors and corruptions of the times. Through the favor of the duke of Lancaster, soon after his ejection from his wardenship, he obtained the rectory of Lutterworth, in the diocese of Lincoln, which he held till his death, faithfully discharging the duties of a pastor.

But Wiclif had bearded the lion in his den. He could not, therefore, retreat with honor, nor with a good conscience. Having looked into the den of corruptions, and beheld the moral pollution with which it was stained, he could not rest without doing all in his power to cleanse it. He, therefore, attacked the vices and the errors of the pope, the clergy, and more especially the monks, with renewed zeal and fresh courage. His friends, however, did not forsake him. In 1372 he took his degree of D. D., and he read lectures on theology with distinguished ability, and great applause. Being thus encouraged, he renewed his assaults upon the prevailing errors of the times, deriving his doctrines from the Holy Scriptures, which he now began to examine.

In 1374, such was the confidence inspired in Wiclif's talents and integrity, that the king of England sent him as his ambassador to Rome, to remonstrate with the pope against the papal *reservations* of churches. It could not have been very agreeable to his holiness to recognize a man as an ambassador from a foreign court who had waged a war against him in so fearless and independent a

manner as Wiclif had done. He was forced, however, to submit to this apparent degradation.

This journey to Rome, however, only inflamed the mind of this intrepid reformer still more against the reigning abominations of the age. Here he saw crime personified in the pope and his obsequious cardinals. His righteous soul was, therefore, vexed still more "with the filthy conversation of the wicked," and he dare not hold his peace. Accordingly, on his return he lifted up his voice like a trumpet against the pope in his theological lectures, calling him, without disguise, "*antichrist*, the proud, worldly priest of Rome, the most cursed of clippers and purse-cutters." Nor did he forget his old friends, the mendicant monks, but poured upon their heads the denunciation of divine wrath.

It could not be expected otherwise than that this conduct, however justifiable in the sight of God, should provoke the wrath of those miserable beings. Accordingly, in 1376, the monks drew up nineteen articles, extracted from his writings, and sent them, as so many specifications against their assailant, to his holiness the pope. The principal of these allegations were the following:—

"1. That there is one only universal church, consisting of the whole body of the *predestinate*.

"2. That the eucharist, after consecration, was not the real body of Christ, but only an *emblem*, or *sign* of it.

"3. That the Church of Rome was no more the head of the universal church than any other church; and that St. Peter had no more authority given him than the rest of the apostles.

"4. That the pope had no more jurisdiction, in the exercise of the keys, than any other priest.

"5. That if the church misbehaved, it was not only lawful, but meritorious to dispossess her of her temporalities.

"6. That when a prince, or temporal lord, was convinced that the church made an ill use of her endowments, he was bound, under pain of damnation, to take them away.

"7. That the gospel was sufficient to direct the Christian in the conduct of his life.

"8. That neither the pope nor any other prelate ought to have prisons for the punishment of offenders against the discipline of the church."

Here, so early as 1376, long before Luther arose in Germany, did Wiclif advance all the essential doctrines of the Reformation; and in the doctrine of the eucharist was much clearer than the German reformer, for the latter never could rid himself of the popish dogma of transubstantiation, giving it but another name, namely, *consubstantiation*, implying that Christ was, in some

mysterious way, united with the bread and wine. Those, therefore, who are thankful to God for the benefits of the Reformation, should not forget that Wiclif opened the way for those who came after him in the road of truth and righteousness; that before either *Huss* or *Jerome* lifted up his voice against popish superstitions and moral delinquencies, the voice of Wiclif was heard roaring like distant thunder against those abominations which had long made desolate the heritage of God, and which at that time were pouring a destructive flood over the land.

But how did the pope receive these denunciations? Why, on the second day of May, 1377, he issued five bulls, addressed to the archbishop of Canterbury and the bishop of London, who were directed to bring the delinquent to trial, and to the king, who was desired to assist the bishops in the ecclesiastical court, and to the university of Oxford, ordering them to deliver up the accused. Before the bulls arrived, the king died; and the university treated the order with the contempt it so richly deserved, throwing their arms around their favorite and highly gifted son. The prelates, however, were more obedient, and summoned Wiclif to appear before them in London, within thirty days.

During this interval, the parliament assembled, and deliberated whether they might lawfully refuse to send treasure out of the kingdom whenever the pope desired it to be sent. And as an evidence of the strong confidence they had in the judgment of Wiclif, the solving of this doubt was, by the king and parliament, referred to him. He answered with the same fearless intrepidity with which he had already denounced the errors and haughty demeanor of the pope and his adherents, that it was lawful, and undertook to prove it was so, by the principles of the law of Christ.

He afterward appeared before his judges to answer the accusations which had been preferred against him by the haughty and contaminated monks. He was attended by his faithful patron, the duke of Lancaster, and the lord marshal, Earl Perry. A vast concourse was assembled to hear the case impleaded. They were, however, disappointed—for some altercations ensuing between the bishops and the two noblemen who attended Wiclif, the assembly was in a commotion, and he was conducted off in safety by his patrons, and thus escaped from trial, and from the clutches of his adversaries. He was then cited to appear at Lambeth. He obeyed the citation, and explained the charges in such a satisfactory manner, that the bishops judged it advisable to accept his explanations, and set him at liberty.

The next year Pope *Gregory XI.* was summoned before a



more impartial tribunal. On his death, his commission to the two bishops to try Wiclif also expired, and he was left at liberty to pursue the path of duty, for a season, without being molested. In his lectures and sermons he embraced every opportunity to expose the vices and abuses of the court of Rome, and to lash the clergy for their luxurious indolence, their ignorance and venality. He also published sixteen theses against transubstantiation, in which he expressly denied the doctrine of the real presence, a point on which Cranmer afterward split with the Church of Rome. The vice-chancellor and eleven doctors of divinity now lifted up their voices against him and condemned his doctrine. He was, therefore, soon called to pass through another fiery ordeal. In 1382 *William Courtney* was translated from the bishopric of London to the archiepiscopal see of Canterbury; and being more zealous than his predecessor for the honors of the church, he proceeded against Wiclif, summoning him to appear before a commission in London to answer for his conduct. Through the advice of his friends, he declined to appear; but the university of Oxford sent a letter in his favor, bearing ample testimony to his learning, piety, and soundness in doctrine. Notwithstanding this strong testimony in his favor, and the able arguments of his counsellors, fourteen of his conclusions were condemned as either heretical or erroneous.

These repeated trials, together with his immense labors, no doubt so wrought upon his physical constitution as to hasten the termination of his mortal existence: for soon after he left Oxford, in 1382, he had a slight shock of the palsy. He continued, however, to preach until 1384, when he was seized a second time, while in his pulpit at Lutterworth, and shortly after expired, aged sixty years.

He left a vast number of tracts behind him, on doctrinal and practical subjects in theology, in which he refuted the errors, and exposed the vices of the age, and particularly of the clergy and monks. But that which gave him the greatest celebrity was his translation of the sacred Scriptures, the first ever made in the English language. This translation was a monument of his learning and industry.

He also left a great number of followers, both in England and elsewhere, who were denominated Wiclifites, and, as a vulgar term of reproach, *Lollards*, a word derived from the Latin *lallo*, which means, to sing in a low voice, to lull to sleep, whence the word *lullaby*.\*

\* This word was first applied as a term of reproach in the beginning of the fourteenth century to a sect of Cellites, because when they carried a person to

After his death his followers were everywhere persecuted by those blood-thirsty monsters, the inquisitors, and other cruel instruments of pontifical vengeance. In the Council of Constance, which was held in 1415, his doctrines and writings were condemned by a solemn decree; and such was the hatred excited against him, that, in 1428, his bones were disinterred, and publicly burned.

Such was the fate of this first of English reformers. Though he may have had his faults, it appears manifest that he was actuated by a holy indignation against the abominations of popery, and an ardent attachment to truth and righteousness. Nor were the effects of his labors confined to England. His writings were read upon the continent, and were consulted by Huss and Jerome of Prague, and no doubt contributed not a little to enlighten their understandings, and to inflame their zeal in the cause of God. It is pleasant, also, to behold, amidst the reigning errors and corruptions of the times, some small rills of truth flowing along the vale of human misery and degradation, from which a few, no doubt, slaked their thirst. During the darkest periods of the church's history there were not wanting some pious and faithful souls, who, sickened with beholding the moral pollutions with which all orders and ranks were tainted, lifted up their voices against them, and strove to wash them away. These, however, were treated as heretics, and their voices silenced by the clamors of those in authority, or by the mandate of the sovereign pontiff. But their labors and sufferings were not in vain. Their blood became "the seed of the church," and their writings were read with avidity by those who followed them. Thus it was with Wiclif. He courageously stemmed the torrent of iniquity which was overflowing the land, and sweeping away every vestige of truth and piety from among men. And though his enemies succeeded in procuring a sentence of condemnation against his writings, and evinced their malice by digging up and burning his moldering bones, yet they could not silence the voice of conscience, nor extinguish the light which he had lit up in the world.

Though we have no certainty that either Huss or Jerome was first moved to action by the writings of Wiclif, yet we are assured

the grave who had died with the plague, they sung a funeral dirge, probably in a soft and mournful voice. And the same term was applied to the followers of Wiclif, either on account of the humble offices of the original Lollards, or from their practice of singing hymns. Their enemies, no doubt, meant it as a term of reproach, and to describe them as poor melancholy creatures, only fit to sing psalms at a funeral.—See *Watson's Dictionary*.

that they afterward consulted them, and were much encouraged and strengthened in their resolute determination to resist the errors and corruptions of the rulers of the church, by the example of this intrepid man of God. And though Luther was indebted to the New Testament for the first ray of light which disclosed to his mind the abominations of popery, yet he doubtless was greatly excited to persevere in his work by reflecting upon the labors of such men as the English and Bohemian reformers.

But they were all both enlightened and strengthened by the numerous examples, as well as by the blazing truths found in the sacred Scriptures. Neither sinful indulgence, nor the abominations of popery, can bear the light of this volume of divine truth. Hence the efforts made by the Church of Rome to suppress it. Hence, also, the efforts made by the reformers to open its pages to the people, well knowing that all who read and understand its language will justify their proceedings. What stronger evidence do we need of the errors of popery on the one hand, and of the truth of Protestantism on the other!

But are we thankful to God for the light and privileges of the Reformation? Let us, then, not forget John Wiclif. He struck the first stroke at the monster of iniquity on English soil. He was the first to open the path to the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures to the English reader. And what were the times in which he lived? Kings, princes, and emperors were obedient to the Roman pontiff. To call in question his word was considered sacrilege. He, indeed, "sat in the temple of God," and claimed the prerogatives of the Most High. "All the world wondered after the beast." Wickedness was exalted to the highest places in the church. Licentiousness and every species of iniquity were sanctioned by the example of popes and their clergy, and they "made merchandise of the souls of men" by selling them an indulgence to commit sin. And yet, in the midst of all these abominations, Wiclif had the boldness to lift up his voice, and to show to the people the iniquity of their priests, and to denounce, in just terms of reprobation, their deceitful practices.

But what effect had the labors of Wiclif on the people? The manner in which he escaped from the malice of his persecutors proves that he made a favorable impression upon his countrymen, high and low. We have already seen with what confidence and respect he was treated by the king and parliament, and the favor which he received from some of the nobles of the land. The fact is, such were the oppressions, the extortions, the cruel exactions, and the vices of the popes and their clergy, their insolence in

demanding homage of princes, and their haughty demeanor toward the people generally, that a spirit of dissatisfaction, amounting almost to rebellion, existed throughout England, and the people were glad to behold in such a man as Wiclif an ability and a courage to expose and resist these perpetual encroachments upon their rights and liberties. Hence, the king, Edward III., as well as many of his nobles, favored Wiclif, protected him against the machinations of his enemies, and encouraged him in his work. It is stated that Johanna, the widow of the Black Prince, John of Gaunt, Anne of Bohemia, queen of Richard II., the Duke of Lancaster, and the Earl Marshall of England, Lord Cobham, who afterward suffered martyrdom, were all favorable to our reformer, and greatly aided him in his endeavors to purify the land from the pollutions of popery.

But what were the effects of his labors on the common people? Did he adapt his labors to their condition? He most assuredly did. Besides translating the sacred Scriptures into the vernacular language of the country, and thereby furnishing the people with an infallible test of the truth of his doctrine, he wrote and circulated numerous tracts, in a popular style, adapted to the capacities of all who could read, and thus instructed them in the knowledge of divine truth. He, moreover, commissioned what he called "poor priests," to itinerate through the land, who preached in markets, in the lanes and streets, as well as in private houses, the word of God to the people. Through these instrumentalities, it is stated that every part of the kingdom was visited, and a very general attention was awakened to the things of religion.

He was led to the adoption of this method of spreading his principles, from the example of the monks, who, to secure the triumph of their order, itinerated from place to place, preaching obedience to the holy mother, and infecting the minds of the people with their pestiferous doctrines. To counteract this influence, Wiclif, having also the example of the apostles and primitive evangelists before him, authorized those priests who were converted to God, and embraced his doctrines, to "go out into the highways and hedges," to itinerate through the length and breadth of the land, with a view to enlighten the people in respect to the errors of popery, and in the knowledge of the truth as it is in Jesus.

Many of these men continued their itinerating labors after his death. And though some of them apostatized, and thereby brought a reproach upon the cause, and others were bribed by the bishops of the church to abjure their faith and come back to the church,



yet some of them suffered death rather than relinquish the cause they had espoused. At length, however, through the persecutions of their enemies, the intrigues of courtly sycophants, and the want of system among themselves, the Wiclifites, or Lollards, became extinct, and the land was left to mourn under the burdens of a deceitful priesthood, until other lights arose to dispel the darkness of a fallen and corrupt church.

Yet the seeds which Wiclif planted were never utterly destroyed. Though the first-fruits were reaped before they were fully ripened, yet the roots remained in the earth, and in due time they germinated, and sprung up, bearing a hundred fold. We ought, therefore, to remember this same poor man, who labored so faithfully to deliver the city.

His courage was equal to his wisdom. Having dipped into the word of God, and tasted of the refreshing streams of redeeming love, he could not do otherwise than invite his fellow-men to come to the pure fountain of eternal life. And no sooner were his eyes opened than he beheld, with amazement, the depth of iniquity into which the church was sunk, and, with a fearless independence, he proclaimed it abroad, that others might fear and give glory to God. God honored his servant by making him instrumental in tearing off the mask by which the pope and his satellites had so long hid their enormities from human view. And though his writings were afterward condemned, and his bones committed to the flames, they could not extinguish the light which he had poured upon the world. So long, therefore, as we prize the word of God, and the blessings of the Reformation, we must be grateful to God for raising up such a man as JOHN WICLIF, whose potent voice shook the throne on which the pope had so long reposed with inglorious ease, and taught the infallible that he was as mutable as other men of like passions with himself.

*Wesleyan University, Dec. 13, 1841.*

ART. V.—*The Cultivation of Vocal Music.*

MUSIC appears to have been coeval with the existence of man. A passion for it was woven into the very texture of the soul, ere the first pair were turned off from the plastic hand of the Creator. Probably, indeed, the highest order of dependent beings in the whole universe, not only relish music, but are singularly qualified for the execution of it. At the laying of the foundation of the earth, according to the book of Job, the "morning stars sang together, and all the sons of God shouted for joy." And at the occurrence of a still more auspicious event, "a multitude of the heavenly host" joined the angel, who announced the birth of the divine Redeemer, in singing, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, and good will to men."

But our present business is rather with the inhabitants of our own sphere. The passion for music is, perhaps, as universal as it is ancient. No people have, we believe, ever yet been found, however rude and barbarous, who are practical strangers to the inspiration of musical sounds. The shivering Icelander and the sun-burnt Moor, the rude Esquimaux and the polished Greek, the barbarian, the Scythian, the bond, the free; all delight in expressing the passions and emotions of the soul, by pouring them forth in what is deemed appropriate song. Though in some instances utterly destitute of those attributes with which science has invested the art, yet when addressed to untrained organs—organs familiar with nothing more finished—the effect may be surprisingly great. The Indian war-song, though wild and inharmonious, is full of excitement, and admirably adapted to arouse and sustain the turbulent passions of a savage bosom. Even the wail of distress from the lips of the untutored child of nature, over the lifeless form of a near relative, or at the grave of departed friendship, though as unchastened as the wind that sighs through the tops of the forest trees when bereft of their foliage, may, nevertheless, be expressive of deep and absorbing emotion. The truth is, the soul, whether affected by joy or sorrow, has its own musical nomenclature, and, when it would speak, is seldom at a loss to employ the right terms.

Of the power of music to move the human passions, history furnishes us with many surprising instances. We are told the ancient Greek musicians, in particular, were able to excite whatever passion they pleased; to inspire love or hatred, joy or grief, hope or fear, courage or despair; to raise these one after another; and to vary the passion just according to the variation of the music.

When Persepolis yielded to the power of Alexander's vast army, that all-conquering general resolved on sparing a city distinguished by so many monuments of human art and genius. But one of his favorite musicians, Timotheus, wished for its demolition, and, striking up one of his most provoking airs, so enraged the mighty chieftain that he ordered its instant destruction; and soon the lofty towers and gorgeous battlements were wrapped in consuming flames!

We have a striking example at a still later period. A musician being brought to the king of Denmark, was asked whether he could excite any passion, to which he replied in the affirmative; and was immediately commanded to make trial on the king himself. Accordingly he had recourse to one of his most plaintive and touching airs, when the monarch was soon bathed in tears and dissolved in tenderness. The musician now adroitly changed his mood, and addressed himself to another class of passions in the royal bosom; when his majesty was roused into such a fury that, seizing the sword of one of his courtiers,—his own having been purposely removed,—he immediately slew the musician, and would have killed all in the room had he not been forcibly restrained!

It is, however, deeply to be regretted that modern music is, almost incomparably, less effective. The writer may not be sufficiently scientific to attempt a formal solution of this problem. Perhaps, indeed, the question might be almost as safely referred to unsophisticated nature as to the refinements of musical science. In truth, we believe the chief reason why the modern is not as effective as the ancient music, is to be found in the simple fact, that the latter departs more widely than the former from the dictates of nature herself. It has become too complex, involving point and counter point, almost *ad infinitum*. Thus melody, the very soul of music, is sacrificed at the shrine of an artificial harmony, that is, a contrast of various notes, opposite to and yet mutually blended with each other. Not that we would wholly condemn the latter by any means; but only the excess of it; the carrying it to an absorbing and injurious extreme; an extreme where harmony is every thing, melody nothing. In perfect music, it seems to us, these qualities are combined in fair and faultless proportions.

It is true that modern music has sometimes been observed to produce a most powerful effect; so that large assemblies have been seen in a flood of tears. But *when* has this been the case? Generally when a fine solo has been sung; when "the sound has

been an echo to the sense ;” when the music has been extremely simple and inartificial, the composer having paid special attention to melody.\* It was then that music, true to nature, took strong hold on the inmost soul, and made the passions ebb and flow at its own bidding. It is upon this ground that most persons are so much affected by Scottish and Irish airs. These are composed, not so much according to modern art, as under the impulses of nature. Being strikingly simple, they are, almost by consequence, strikingly melodious. One can hardly tell why, but the wild notes of the Highlander, or the soft echoes from the “*Emerald Isle*,” often play upon the delicate sensibilities of the soul, until the heart itself seems melting away into liquid emotion !

It is no more than a simple act of justice for the writer to say, that by modern music is meant the music of the last century or two. The defect of which he has ventured to speak is becoming less frequent. The last twenty years have effected a most pleasing change. A perverted public taste is gradually yielding to good sense and sound philosophy. The complicated, we had almost said the impracticable, music of our childhood is giving way to a more simple, easy, and effective species of composition. Nature, long trammelled, tortured, and stifled, is permitted to speak out, and is beginning to hold her native empire over the world of song. Drawing in to her aid the true philosophy of musical sounds, she is carrying forward a most desirable reformation. Finally, in this connection, we would say, let the whole system of musical science undergo such modifications as will make it at once true to nature and consistent with its lofty objects, and then let it be carried to the highest possible state of practical perfection.

Having indulged in these preliminary observations, it seems proper for the writer now to say, that he is strongly in favor of a much more general cultivation of music—particularly of vocal music. He would be glad to have it made a constituent part of education everywhere. In this country, as in Germany, it should be incorporated into our system of common-school instruction. Or, at any rate, systematic and ample provision should be made for developing the musical talent and cultivating the vocal organs of the rising generation, “in the length and in the breadth” of our country. For this opinion a multitude of reasons crowd upon the mind, only a few of which will our limits permit us to mention, and these only in a very abridged form.

1. All can learn to sing. This statement may require a little explanation. A few instances occur, perhaps one in a thousand,

\* See an excellent article on this subject by the late Rev. John Wesley.



in which the child seems to have no ear for music, and consequently is incapable of singing. Experiment has, however, fully demonstrated, that, in most of these cases, a latent talent for music was in actual existence; for persevering effort has developed it.

Instances are not rare in which persons, supposed to be wholly destitute of the faculty to sing, have, after their conversion to God, been able to take a very respectable and edifying part in conducting the devotions of the sanctuary. The natural defect was found to be merely imaginary. As soon as the *heart* was attuned to the songs of Zion, the appropriate vocal organs were at once commanded. Even the tongue of the dumb was made to sing. Now regeneration is not a physical change. We have the same faculties of body, and the same powers of mind, after we are "born again," that we had before. Neither the soul nor the body is invested with any new function. The change is purely moral, and yet it rouses the whole man, and develops talent that was before thought to have no existence.

But where the incapacity does *really* exist, it is chargeable not on nature, but on a negligent ancestry. The defect may be organic, and, consequently, hereditary; but like other hereditary physical defects, it may be gradually corrected; so that, in a few generations, the lost talent would be universally restored. To some this may be a new idea, and yet we are persuaded there is scarcely any other position in physics, the truth of which is supported by stronger or more unexceptionable evidence.

2. Singing will greatly improve the voice for conversation, reading, and public speaking, by giving smoothness, volume, and variety to its tones. It is a law of nature that it should be so, and certainly accords with universal observation, that proper exercise strengthens our animal no less than our mental faculties. For instance, those muscles which are specially put in requisition by any particular calling, are always observed gradually to adjust themselves to their special office, and, by use, to become larger and larger, stronger and stronger, or more and more elastic, as the particular case may require. Thus it is with the vocal organs. Like all other physical faculties, as well simple as compound, they may be greatly improved by proper use.

That man who, in profound silence, is ever poring over his books will soon ruin the organs in question, while he who accustoms himself to read aloud will greatly strengthen and improve them. The writer has a friend, a distinguished clergyman, who, at an early period in public life, had an exceedingly feeble voice, attri-

butable, no doubt, in part, to his college habits. To relieve his lungs, he adopted the practice of whispering—not speaking in a low tone, but actually *whispering*—during the whole week, to the end that he might have sufficient strength on the sabbath to proclaim to his people the great messages of divine mercy. As a natural consequence, his voice became weaker and weaker, till he was almost utterly unable to articulate. Fortunately he discovered the cause of his vital weakness, and reversed his habits. Instead of whispering, he adopted the opposite practice of speaking moderately loud, and of speaking frequently in the open air. The result was most salutary. He is now filling a station that requires him often to address large assemblies, and the ease with which he does it would astonish one who knew him only at the time first referred to. The philosophy of the thing is plain, and is strikingly illustrated by the genial influence of singing on the vocal organs.

The admirable vocal powers of our aboriginal inhabitants have often been matter of special observation. Their voices have a volume, a sweetness, a compass, a power with which those of their “pale-faced” successors would illy compare. Nor is the fact at all wonderful. Upon the principle just laid down it is easily explained. From childhood they are accustomed to speak in the open air, to mimic the owl and the panther, to respond to the parental summons from the deep glen and from the mountain top, to shout to their fellows amidst the raging tempest, to sing the war-song, and the like, all of which directly tend to expand the chest, to give elasticity to the vocal organs; in a word, to invest them with all that superiority of which we have just spoken.

3. The cultivation of vocal music in the rising generation greatly contributes to domestic harmony and felicity. It has a softening and hallowing influence on the whole family circle. Instead of angry collision between the children, they will be led by it to love one another, and to cherish toward each other the most kind and obliging feelings. And, having acquired the elements of the science, so far from seeking amusement in low and vulgar plays, they will delight to spend their leisure hours in “speaking to each other in psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs”—thus sending a thrill of chastened pleasure around the whole family circle, and breathing into the little community something of the spirit of heaven.

4. The practice recommended exerts a good moral influence. Singing, in itself, when properly directed, is admirably adapted to control the wayward propensities of the heart, and to fill the bosom with pure and lofty sentiments. And then an

incidental advantage accrues, upon which we place a very high estimate. The practice of singing gives rise to innocent and improving associations. The social propensities of the young *will* find an outlet in some quarter. If those to whom Providence has committed their guardianship do not seize upon these propensities, and give them the proper direction, other agents will always be at hand to control and pervert them. The writer has been in circumstances to make somewhat extensive observation, and must say that he has rarely known the young man or young woman that loved sacred music, who has, cherishing this propensity, fallen into habits of gross immorality. On the contrary, he has been acquainted with some scores, if not hundreds, who have been led by their singing associations to the foot of the cross. This fact alone stands in the place of a volume of argument in support of our position.

5. Finally, and especially, we would have all learn to sing, because we would have a much higher character given to our church music. The importance of sacred song in the ancient Jewish worship is well known. Of its beauty and usefulness in the Christian church, when conducted in a manner suited to its lofty purpose, and not prostituted to levity, or perverted by ostentation, few are wholly insensible. "It is good," says one, upon whose experience we may confidently rely, "to sing praises; for it is pleasant, and praise is comely." Of joyful praise to the King of Zion, it may with great propriety be said, "It delights heaven, earth, ourselves: 'tis duty, glory, peace." But how often is it the case, even in a populous community, that there is extreme difficulty in commanding a sufficient number of trained voices to conduct, even in an indifferent way, this important part of our sanctuary service! The hymn is announced from the sacred desk, but the absence of a few individuals from the choir arrests proceedings, and the praises of God are postponed to a more favorable concurrence of circumstances! And why is it so? Is it because he who is at once the God of nature and the great Head of the church has withheld from his people the appropriate original faculties? By no means. Were this the case the omission should be borne as a misfortune, and certainly never would be imputed to us as a fault. Such, however, is not the fact. God has given us the talent, but, instead of improving it, we have, like the unfaithful servant in the gospel, "hid it in a napkin." Like that servant, too, it is to be apprehended, we shall be "speechless" in the day of final retribution. We may now seek to excuse ourselves from the cultivation of our faculties, and offer apologies for our silence in the house of

God, but it is to be feared that the whole matter will wear a very different aspect in the eyes of an assembled universe. It will then be seen, that our omission to sing is chargeable rather upon indolence or negligence, than upon any insuperable defect in our physical organization.

Were this matter duly understood, and the corrective properly applied, we should have almost as many singers as worshipers in our places of devotion. The whole congregation would rise up, *en masse*, and pour forth such a volume of musical sound as would resemble the sublime scene of the Apocalypse, when the beloved disciple "heard as it were the voice of a great multitude, and as the voice of many waters, and as the voice of mighty thunders, saying, Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth !" Go to the Protestant part of Germany ; go to Scotland, especially the latter, for an example. There, particularly in the larger churches, the "precentor," or *chorister*, as we would call him in this country, occupies a desk immediately in front and below the pulpit. While the psalm is being given out from the latter, the precentor hangs out in front, and on each side of his desk, a card on which is printed, in large letters, the name of the tune to be sung ; so that every worshiper in the house may understand in due time what is expected, and be prepared to lift up his voice in sacred song.

We know no reason why singing should be made the exclusive business of a few, any more than why praying should be made the exclusive business of a few. Such a monopoly, it strikes us, would be infinitely more exceptionable than any of which the politician is wont to complain. It would be to engross a privilege, which, under the impartial constitution of Heaven, is designed to be common to the household of faith. "Singing," says our excellent form of Discipline, "is a part of divine worship in which *all* the congregation ought to join." The ministry are, therefore, directed to "exhort every person in the congregation to sing, and not one in ten only."

Let not the musical connoisseur be alarmed at the proposition which is here made, as though we would turn his world of order into "chaos and old night again." No such result would necessarily follow the change which the writer has ventured to propose. Only let the young be taught to sing ; only let music be universally cultivated ; only let all do their duty, and the whole congregation would form one vast choir, and the church a mighty orchestra ; resembling heaven itself, where no tongue is mute, and where "the new song" is sung with such overpowering sweetness by that innumerable company gathered from every nation, and kindred,



and tongue, and people under the whole heavens. Nor is it contended, that, as a general thing, our congregational singing should be conducted without a choir. This deeply interesting and highly important branch of our sanctuary service should, doubtless, be led by the best cultivated and most skillful voices that can be commanded for that purpose. Without adopting some such plan it will be hardly possible to secure that concert so indispensable to congregational harmony. "Order is the first law of nature," and nowhere else can it be more vital than here. And, in order to this, the chorister should control the choir, and the choir the congregation. Thus there will be a sort of convergency to a common centre.

Nor is it needful that the adoption of this plan should be delayed till a new generation is trained with special reference to it. In all that is strictly essential, it *may* and *SHOULD* go into effect immediately. There are scores in all our congregations who can sing; who have, in fact, been taught to do so; but who are, nevertheless, silent from sabbath to sabbath, as if it were no part of *their* duty to "praise God in the beauty of his holiness." Let such take heed how they continue in a course of disobedience to one of the plainest commands of God. Like the unfruitful fig-tree, they may be smitten with perpetual barrenness: in retributive justice God may say, "Let no fruit grow on thee henceforth for ever." All should take their hymn-books with them to the house of God, and carefully trace the sentiment of the hymn—whether they are able to join in singing it or not. They should, at least, "make melody in their *hearts* unto the Lord." Though disabled by weakness, or prevented by utter want of original talent, they should, notwithstanding, take an interest in the exercise. Every thing like supine inadvertency should be carefully avoided. If we cannot sing vocally, we should do it sentimentally. If able to do no more, we should convince all present that

"Praise sits silent on our tongues."

Instead of lounging or yawning, while others "try their choicest strains," we should follow them with our voices as far as we can, and beyond this with our profound attention.

The heavenly inhabitants "serve God day and night in his temple." Of that service singing forms no inconsiderable part. And if we would be prepared to unite in "the song of Moses and the Lamb," we should now acquire the requisite habits, and seek the requisite qualifications.

Zeta.

*Oneida, Sept. 28, 1841.*

ART. VI.—*Delineation of Roman Catholicism, drawn from the authentic and acknowledged Standards of the Church of Rome; namely, her Creeds, Catechisms, Decisions of Councils, Papal Bulls, Roman Catholic Writers, the Records of History, &c., &c., in which the peculiar Doctrines, Morals, Government, and Usages of the Church of Rome are stated, treated at large, and confuted.* By REV. CHARLES ELLIOTT, D. D. In two vols., 8vo. New-York: published by G. Lane. 1841.

IT is with no ordinary emotions of gratification that we introduce to our readers this able and original work, by a worthy minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and one whose age, learning, and piety, as well as laborious services in our itinerant ranks, entitle him to the highest meed of respect and veneration. He has been favorably known as editor of the *Western Christian Advocate*, published at Cincinnati, Ohio, for the special benefit of the population in the great valley of the Mississippi. To this office he was called by the General Conference of 1836, and has since that period continued to sustain it with great reputation. In this relation he has had his attention peculiarly called to the devices of Romanism for the extension of her domain of superstition, especially in this western world; and his official location afforded him facilities for perfecting and completing the work whose title-page stands at the head of this article, and for which he had been long collecting the materials. Indeed, for more than twenty-two years the author of this work has been sedulously occupied in researches having for their object a thorough delineation and refutation of Roman Catholicism, and the gigantic errors and heresies upon which this "mystery of iniquity" is founded. For this purpose, he has found time, amid the literary and ministerial labors devolving upon him in the various official relations he has sustained in the church, to wade through the huge Latin and Greek folios of the councils; the bulls of their holinesses who have successively occupied the chair of St. Peter as popes; the voluminous works of the ancient fathers, and the ponderous volumes of theologians and historians, which, for the most part, are inaccessible to the general reader.

Having thus accumulated, by immense labor and research, all the necessary materials furnished by ancient and modern writers, who are acknowledged as standards and authorities by the Roman Catholic Church, he has classified and condensed the whole in these volumes, so as to furnish the student with an authentic work, to which he can appeal for testimony on every topic connected with

the controversy between Roman Catholics and Protestants, accompanied by references to the authorities, in the languages in which they were originally written, which will be found either in the text or in the notes.

With these authentic and acknowledged standards of the Roman Catholic Church, as the basis of his delineation of their system, he has utterly deprived them of their stale and oft-repeated complaints of being misrepresented or misunderstood; and hence the author of these volumes defies their scrutiny, while he challenges them to a discussion of all the distinctive characteristics of their ecclesiastical edifice. He alleges nothing as a part of their creed, except on their own authorities, and these such as they dare not disavow; and no Roman Catholic can consistently reject. Armed at every point, and with weapons drawn from their own armory, the author has here thrown down the gauntlet to the army of the Roman hierarchy at home and abroad, not in the vain-glorious spirit of an angry polemic, but as a bold and uncompromising defender of "the faith once delivered to the saints." In the name of the God of the armies of Israel, whose he is, and whom he serves, he goes forth to do battle against this mighty Philistine of papal Rome; and he makes war not upon the individuals, whether priests or people, who rally under the banner of "holy mother Church," because of their antagonist position to the Protestantism he defends; but he makes the assault upon the system of Romanism as such, because of the outrages and indignities which that system presumptuously perpetrates against the offended majesty of truth.

But it is time that the reader was introduced to the brief analysis of the work, which is all that our limits will allow. The first volume opens by an assault upon the very citadel of "the man of sin," in an elaborate and scholastic exposition of the "RULE OF FAITH." And at once the appeal is made directly to the standards of the Roman Catholic faith, which are claimed to be immutable and infallible authority. Among these unexceptionable and unimpeachable witnesses we find the creed and oath of Pius IV.; the episcopal oath of feudal allegiance to the pope, exacted from every bishop; the Tridentine Catechism; the general councils, particularly that of Trent; the successive papal bulls; the liturgical books, such as the breviary, missal, pontificals, rituals; their own traditions; the ancient fathers; the Scriptures as explained by them; and their books of devotion. On each of these several topics we find strictures and animadversions, touching the subterfuges and evasions to which Roman Catholic controversialists are wont to



resort when pressed with these, their own authorities. For though all these are the immutable decisions of the infallible church, which their own people are taught to receive implicitly, as downright certainty; yet when Protestants employ them in argument, they are all transformed into matters of doubt and uncertainty. Truly "there is nothing they dread so much as the testimony of their own church," and even upon the all-important subject of the "rule of faith," their rule of controversy is to "admit of nothing, and deny every thing," and when pressed with the recorded acts of popes, councils, cardinals, and bishops, and it becomes necessary for the defense of the church, they retreat within her infallible inclosure, and raise the hue and cry of misrepresentation. But the author piles authority upon authority until he fortifies the oracular response of the infallible church by such a number and variety of proofs as to disarm every antagonist, and defy either evasion or criticism. And then into the dark caverns of Romish error and heresy on this all-important topic he pours the sunlight of divine truth, in one burning focus, concentrated by "the oracles of God."

Next the author proceeds to show from the acknowledged and supreme authorities of the Roman Catholic Church, their doctrine concerning "THE SCRIPTURES," demonstrating that they virtually reject the Hebrew and Greek of the Old and New Testaments, substituting therefor their own Latin Vulgate edition, or the Douay and Rhemish translations, including the Apocrypha, and allowing even to this Bible no claim to inspiration or authority, which is not equally awarded to tradition, which last, indeed, they presumptuously include with Scripture, as constituting jointly "the word of God." Nor will the Roman Catholic Church allow to this "word of God," embracing both *Scripture and tradition*, any authority as a "rule of faith;" even as either or both may be interpreted by any bishop or priest. But in addition to these, though designated by themselves as the word of God, their "rule of faith" is shown to include the "acts and decisions of the church," embracing eight folio volumes of the pope's bulls; ten folio volumes of the Decretals; thirty-one folio volumes of acts of councils; fifty-one folio volumes of the *Acta Sanctorum*, or the Doings of the Saints; and thirty-five volumes of the Greek and Latin fathers, in which is to be found what they call "the unanimous consent." Besides these one hundred and thirty-five folio volumes, their "rule of faith" likewise includes all the chaos of *unwritten* traditions, which have floated down from the apostolic times. Well may the author affirm that "such a rule is no rule. No



Romanist can possibly *believe*, much less *learn*, his own rule of faith."

We regard the learning and ability displayed in this single chapter, devoted to the expose of the doctrine of the Scriptures held and taught by the Roman Catholic Church; and the ample vindication of the "word of God" from the profane and impious desecration it has suffered from Romanism, as more thorough and conclusive than has ever been produced by any previous writer upon this controversy. Indeed, Jesuitism itself will be puzzled to detect a flaw in the argument, and every Protestant Christian who reads it will be constrained to feel that the author has left nothing to be desired in either evidence, exposition, argument, or defense. He has here grappled with the mightiest minds ever enlisted in the cause of Romanism, and has literally demolished every vestige of logic and sophistry which has been arrayed against the Scriptures as the only rule of faith and practice. And he then justly retorts upon the Church of Rome, by subjecting their several boasted editions and translations of the Bible to a withering criticism, and annihilating their fallacious pretensions to instrumentality in preserving and perpetuating the sacred canon. This task is performed with merited severity, and indeed the entire chapter must be regarded as a masterpiece of its kind, a model of acute and logical argumentation.

Their doctrine concerning "TRADITION," written and unwritten, is next stated in the precise words of their standards, with the exposition of their own acknowledged authorities; and here the inconsistencies, contradictions, and differences of the infallible church on this single subject, are exposed by numerous striking illustrations. And after a luminous investigation of the whole subject of oral traditions, and the enormous frauds of Romanism by inventing new traditions, the author wrests from the Roman Catholic Church the arrogant and false pretension, so vauntingly made, that Protestantism is indebted to tradition for the evidence of the genuineness of the Scriptures, and for numerous cardinal doctrines of the gospel. He here shows that the Scriptures do not depend upon oral tradition for the evidence of their authenticity; and that with respect to infant baptism, &c., we are not dependent upon the traditions of the Church of Rome, for we have those of the Syriac, Greek, African, and ancient Italian churches, independent of Rome. And here the heresy of the Church of Rome, in conceding to infidels in Italy, and Socinians in Poland, that the divinity of Christ cannot be proved by the Bible, but can only be sustained by tradition, is visited with a merited rebuke.

As the "WRITINGS OF THE FATHERS" are claimed under the name of tradition, these are next considered, and the pretensions of each examined. And here he proves that those of the fathers who lived near the apostles' time concur in the Protestant estimate of the Scriptures, and furnish no evidence in behalf of tradition, as contradistinguished from revelation. The author produces the direct testimony of twenty-six of the fathers of the first six centuries, all of whom establish his position that the Scripture alone is the rule of faith, while neither of them gives the shadow of evidence in favor of popish tradition. He demonstrates that no one of the early heresies, which sprung up after the death of the apostles, was attempted to be sustained by an appeal to Scripture, but uniformly to unwritten traditions. And on this department of the subject the work before us abounds with arguments and authorities absolutely invincible.

"INFALLIBILITY," the proudest boast of Romanism, and which has never ceased to be clamorously claimed as their prescriptive and exclusive possession, is next examined at great length. Their doctrine being first stated in the express words of their standards; and the variety of their infallible dissensions, and disagreements, as to the *seat* and the *extent* of the infallibility claimed, having been exhibited by indisputable documents from their own archives; the pretensions of individual popes and councils, singly and collectively, are exposed by the light of historic truth, and also the claims set up for infallibility by the universal church itself, as contradistinguished from popes and councils. Here it is shown, by irrefragable proofs, that popes and councils have not only forfeited every semblance of claim to infallibility, but have been arrayed against each other in deadly hostility, not merely in doctrine, but in practice, and that flagrant heresy, and immorality, and high-handed wickedness, have been proved, and conceded as justly chargeable against these infallible ecclesiastics, and this by their own acknowledged authorities. Infallible popes, contradicting and excommunicating infallible popes; and equally infallible councils, branding these and one another with reprobation as heretics, are enumerated with references to the proofs in their own libraries. And, finally, we have a patient discussion and refutation of this entire heresy, together with a plea and vindication in behalf of the Protestant rule of faith, the Bible; and its infallibility shown to abide the precise tests by which the claim of Romanism has been demolished.

"THE ANCIENT FATHERS" themselves, throughout all their ponderous folios, are the subject of the next chapter; and here the

author proves not only alterations of these authorities by Romanists, but their own avowal and justifications for thus mutilating and corrupting them. Examples and illustrations are furnished, showing how diligently the ecclesiastics of Rome have thus labored by forgeries, and erasures, and falsifying passages, to obtain what they call "*the unanimous consent*" to their dogmas, many of which are denounced as heresy by the original works of these fathers, while others are novelties in themselves, which they attribute to these fathers by interpolating testimony in their new editions of their works. All this and more is substantiated against popes, cardinals, inquisitors, bishops, and councils of the Church of Rome, by an amount of labor and research among these tomes of antiquity, for which few besides the author have had the perseverance and physical strength which such a herculean task requires. And besides the precise proofs brought from the oldest and most authentic of their works, these mutilations and forgeries upon the writings of the ancient fathers are confirmed by the undeniable testimony of the "*Index Expurgatorius*," prepared by the inquisitors under the authority of the king of Spain and the archbishop of Toledo, from which, and other indices, copious extracts are furnished.

Having thus vindicated the fathers from the foul heresies, ascribed to the best of them by means of this vile imposture, he goes on to show that many of these fathers held and taught the greatest errors in both doctrine and morals, and these precise errors have been condemned as heresies by the Church of Rome herself, and this in her highest ecclesiastical tribunals. Moreover, they flatly contradict and condemn each other in multiplied examples, which are here indicated; nor is their "*unanimous consent*" given to any one peculiar doctrine of Romanism, as since held and taught; while to many of them, and on vital points too, the most venerable and eminent among the fathers were irreconcilably opposed. So that their claiming "*the unanimous consent of the fathers*," as being necessary to their rule of faith, is shown to be utterly preposterous. And yet while the doctrines and morals of these ancient writings are shown not to stand the test of Holy Scripture, so as to furnish a safe rule either for faith or practice; their historical testimony is regarded as furnishing the most withering evidence against the novelties of Romanism.

A brief chapter, exhibiting an argumentative comparison between the Roman Catholic and Protestant rules of faith, terminates this department. In this portion of the work alone, the author has condensed an amount of information and authorities, for which



whole libraries might be ransacked in vain ; and it will furnish the student of this controversy a standard of reference, which he will prize for centuries to come, should not antichrist be sooner overthrown.

We pass now to the second book of the volumes before us, which treats of the "SEVEN SACRAMENTS OF THE CHURCH OF ROME." After an exposition and examination of their general doctrine of the sacraments, in which their errors, and novelties, and wicked perversions of Scripture, are detected and refuted, as well as the gross delusions and flagrant impostures which they sacrilegiously palm upon their people, the author shows the iniquity and danger to the souls of men inseparable from their doctrine on this important subject.

In illustration and confirmation of these views, he proceeds to examine each of their alleged sacraments, in detail, and at considerable length.

With respect to BAPTISM, one of the *two only* Christian sacraments out of the *seven* instituted by Romanism, the author convicts them of the following unscriptural dogmas, and fundamental errors, which in this sacred relation are so many heresies, viz. :—

1. Faith is made void by substituting baptism in its place.
2. Water baptism is in their creed identical with regeneration.
3. That water baptism is absolutely essential to salvation.
4. That to prevent the damnation of infant children, they should be baptized by laymen or women, whether Christians or Jews, heretics or infidels ; and hence they allow surgeons and midwives to baptize those who perish in the birth, and direct them to put a drop of water in due form upon some part of the infant, even in cases of abortion, or premature birth. And when the mother must die, the surgical operation for removing the child sufficiently alive for baptism is directed as the only means of saving the infant from damnation ! Compulsory baptism is also justified to adults for the same reason, and a child which is dying is baptized if the mother will throw it into a well with the intention to baptize it as the church does, if it might otherwise die unbaptized. And so also *monsters* are to be baptized hypothetically, saying, "*If thou art a man,*" &c., &c.
5. The ceremonies which precede baptism by the church, including blessing the water, and mixing it with holy oil and chrism ; the exorcism ; the salt ; the sign of the cross ; and priest's spittle.
6. Ceremonies at the font, including anointing with the oil of catechumens, &c.



7. Ceremonies following baptism, embracing the oil of chrism, white garment, burning light, &c.

These doctrines, usages, and ceremonies, pervert the ordinance into a mere incantation or charm, and are wholly unscriptural and absurd. And yet all are claimed to be apostolic, and the Bible is so expounded as to authorize the use of all these unmeaning and ridiculous ceremonies.

"CONFIRMATION," the second Romish sacrament, is examined and disposed of briefly, but conclusively. The texts of Scripture alleged in its favor are shown to give it no countenance whatever. The matter used in confirmation, called chrism, made of olive oil and balsam, though impiously ascribed to Christ and his apostles, from whom the manner of making chrism is stated to have been handed down through St. Dennis and Pope Fabian, is shown to be a comparative novelty, introduced by Silvester. Besides, the celebrated epistle, attributed to Pope Fabian, is proved to be a forgery, on the authority of Dens himself. And yet, on the authority of this fabrication, it is affirmed by the Romish Church that this sacrament was instituted by Christ himself at the last supper, and the matter and form of words used were then divinely appointed. The whole of the absurd and ridiculous ceremonies of this sacrament are shown to be unscriptural, as is the doctrine concerning it throughout, it being a compound of superstition, idolatry, and imposture.

The third sacrament in order is the "EUCCHARIST," in the consideration of which the doctrines of transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the mass, half-communion, and the worship of the host, are each separately examined. And first, of "TRANSUBSTANTIATION," we find the doctrine stated in the precise language of the Council of Trent, the Roman and American Catechisms, &c., and thus there can be no misapprehension or misrepresentation complained of. Indeed, it is impossible to present the doctrine in language more repugnant to Scripture and reason than that employed in these documents, nor yet more impracticable to all human and divine faith.

In confutation of this shocking heresy, the author has elaborated an argument, founded on Scripture and reason, which is, of itself, a monument of learning, philosophy, and piety, and will impress the reader with the conviction that the subject could not have fallen into abler hands. In refuting this doctrine, he proves that it has no foundation in Scripture, in general, nor in the words of the institution in particular, and he does this by a critical exegesis of the texts relied on by Romanists, and an analysis of all their arguments in its favor. And not content with depriving it of Scriptural

support, and demonstrating that it involves contradictions, absurdities, and impossibilities, he proceeds to show that transubstantiation is essential impiety and blasphemy. And having done this by numerous proofs and illustrations, and having stated and answered all the arguments found in their ancient or modern authorities, he cites the testimony of the ancient fathers in proof that this was not held or taught in the primitive church. Indeed, he establishes the Protestant doctrine to have been the faith of all the early fathers, and proves that it was not until the year 1215 that any council had agreed to transubstantiation as a doctrine of the church, nor that it was authoritatively established until 1551, and then after centuries of conflict and resistance. Moreover, he proves that the word transubstantiation was first used in the year 1100 by Stephen, the bishop of Augustodunum, after unsuccessful attempts had been made to corrupt the eucharist by so foul a perversion of the Scriptures to this end. So that it is apparent that both the name and the doctrine, instead of descending from antiquity, are among the novelties of Romanism.

And yet how scandalous have been the cruel and bloody persecutions which this heresy has engendered ! More Christians have been murdered for denying this doctrine than for the denial of all their other articles of religion. In remarking on this, the author appropriately introduces from Archbishop Tillotson the following exclamation :—

“ O blessed Saviour ! thou best and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagine that thou didst ever intend that men should kill one another for not flattering the pride and presumption of the priest, who says he can *make God* ! and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the people, who are made to believe that they can *eat him* ? ”

The “ SACRIFICE OF THE MASS ” is a heresy nearly identical with transubstantiation, and is separately discussed, with the view to show that it is not only unsupported by Scripture, but directly contrary to it. And, moreover, it is justly argued that it is derogatory to the one perfect propitiatory sacrifice of Christ on the cross, besides being barbarous and inhuman intrinsically. The author, likewise, comments on the celebration of the mass in an unknown tongue, and muttering its ceremonies, besides, inaudibly ; and he contrasts the free and gratuitous diffusion of the benefits of Christ’s sacrifice upon the cross, with the mercenary dispensation of the sacrifice of the mass *for money* ! As the *intention* of the priest in offering this sacrifice is essential to the benefits being received by the partakers, every communicant must feel the importance of

propitiating the good will of the ghostly father by bountiful *fees*. How unlike the gospel of Christ, and how very like a false and corrupt religion, to expose its spiritual blessings on sale for money! and yet such is the practice of the Romish Church in the sacrifice of the mass.

"HALF COMMUNION" is the next topic of discussion, and here the author constructs a Scriptural argument, which is ample and conclusive against this innovation, if its palpable absurdity were not sufficient for its rejection. After proving that the decrees of councils, enforcing half-communion, do, nevertheless, admit that it is contrary to the universal usages of the apostolic and primitive church, he examines, in detail, the reasons given in justification of this alteration of a divine institution, and exposes their absurdity and iniquity. He shows the date of the introduction of this novelty in the Roman Catholic Church itself to have been 1415.

The "WORSHIP OF THE HOST," or adoration of the wafer, is made the subject of a brief chapter, in which the author proves, by their own explicit decrees, that the worship of the host is enjoined to be practiced on pain of eternal damnation. And that it is to be adored with that *highest worship due to the true God!* This flagrant idolatry is shown to be the legitimate result of transubstantiation, being unknown to the usages, even of the Roman Catholic Church, until the year after this was made an article of faith by the Lateran Council in 1215. The utter demolition of that parent and kindred heresy in the preceding pages, relieved the author from any very extended references to this its fruit. On the iniquitous idolatry of this worship, however, he expends a few pages of just and withering rebuke.

The sacrament of "PENANCE" is the next topic in the order of this work, comprising absolution, contrition, confession, and satisfaction. In considering each of these branches of the subject in detail, the astounding iniquity of Romanism is exposed in a clear light. Penance is substituted for repentance, while the power of forgiving sins is claimed and impiously exercised by the priesthood, and the author proves that they profess to do this *judicially*, and not ministerially. Their highest canons expressly declare this power to inhere in wicked priests, themselves living in mortal sin. At the same time they teach that without the sacrament of penance, and priestly absolution, neither repentance nor faith will avail for the pardon of sins committed after baptism. The perversions of Scripture, on which they pretend to rely for this doctrine, are all wrested from them by the author, who shows conclusively that neither the apostles, nor the primitive church, either held or



taught this heresy. The abominations of auricular confession, in its effects upon priests and people, are portrayed in this connection, by proofs and illustrations not to be gainsayed, and it is shown that this practice was not introduced until the tenth century. Their doctrine of contrition and attrition is next examined, and its unscriptural character, and its mischievous and ruinous consequences to the souls of men, are presented in a striking light. And so also their dogma of satisfaction, included in the sacrament of penance, is demonstrated to be essential heresy by an extended argument, which our limits forbid us to detail.

The next topic considered is that of "PURGATORY," and the author has bestowed upon it an ample and thorough investigation. After exhibiting the doctrine in its native deformity, and its demoralizing tendencies, he examines it in the light of Scripture and reason; produces the testimony of the ancient fathers; compares it with the creed of the primitive church; exposes the false miracles, by which ignorance and superstition are imposed on with pretended proofs; and shows that the whole farce of praying for the dead is but a priestly device to make merchandise of the souls of men. The entire argument, illustrations, and proofs adduced by the author, we would insert here if we had the space; but we must forbear.

The high-handed and heaven-daring iniquity of "INDULGENCES," constitutes the theme of the next chapter, and the doctrine of the Romish Church, with the arguments by which her apologists seek to support it, having been criticised and refuted, we are furnished with copies of indulgences, ancient and modern; and the enormous mischiefs which flow from the practice are clearly pointed out. That they impiously license sin, and thus legalize the most horrid crimes, by these indulgences, and that this is done for money, the amount of which is proportioned to the heinousness of the offense against God and man, are shown by facts, historically attested, as well as by reference to the tax-book of the Roman chancery. In this way deeds of infamy and blood may be committed by authority of holy mother Church, provided only that the pope, bishop, or priest, is duly paid the price assessed in this apostolic tax-book. Indulgences may be bought for the living or for the dead; and for any number of specified murders or adulteries, or for all the nameless crimes which may be committed during future life, if the price be paid. Popes have sold indulgences for ten and twenty thousand years, so that the impunity thus promised to crime, includes not merely exemption from temporal punishment in the present life, but assures the culprit of deliverance from the fires of purgatory in



the future world. And, finally, by the recent date of indulgences, and other proofs, it is apparent, that the doctrine and practice of indulgences still furnish a source of immense gains to the Romish priesthood, and that, as in other respects, so also in this, there has been *no reformation* in the Church of Rome.

"EXTREME UNCTION," one of their seven sacraments, is next considered. Its matter is, oil blessed by a bishop, and applied by a priest to different parts of the body in cases of sickness, in which death is apprehended, baptism having been premised. The authorities upon which this fiction, delusion, and imposture are palmed upon the ignorant and superstitious, are examined at length, whether alleged to be drawn from revelation or antiquity, and it is apparent that the doctrine has no support from either. And, it is shown to be essentially absurd, as well as fatally deceptive, though, like indulgences, it is rendered a source of extortion and mercenary exactions by the clergy. The dying man is taught to regard this sacrament as necessary to his salvation, and the family or friends of one in the article of death cannot scruple to pay the bishop for the blessed oil, and the priest for administering the extreme unction, even though the money be raised by appropriating the alms which charity has given for the relief of the dying, or the sustenance of his famishing family; for even this is proved to have been done on the authority of priest Croly, of Ireland.

"ORDERS," being another of their sacraments, is next subjected to examination. The contrariety of opinion on this subject of ordination, as to the number of orders included in the sacrament, is here demonstrated to have always existed in the infallible church, some contending for few, while others insist on many orders. Even the Council of Trent did not decide conclusively the number of orders, nor has any other authority settled this question, nor indeed has it ever been definitely determined how many orders are sacraments. The whole subject, however, is here investigated, and the proofs adduced that, on this topic, the doctrines of the Church of Rome are "confusion worse confounded." The pretence of their having the true apostolic succession is thoroughly overthrown by the evidence of both Scripture and antiquity, in both of which departments the author is profoundly versed, and his argument on this subject is elaborated with great skill and effect. We regret that we are too restricted to say more.

"MATRIMONY" is the last of their so-called sacraments, and here the author has availed himself of the unscriptural dogmas of the Church of Rome in relation to the validity and invalidity of marriage, as well as the impediments dissolving it, than which nothing

more clearly proves the corruption and iniquity of Romanism. The examples he cites on this subject are striking and conclusive proofs that the Romish Church claims authority to set aside the laws of God as null and void, and the popes not only grant dispensations for adulterous marriages, when they may thus gain for the church the favor of the state, as in the case of kings and princes ; but they dissolve marriages, when the husbands take holy orders, as well as enjoin celibacy on their clergy, and other religious orders, and even authoritatively decide that a life of virginity is preferable to the married life in all persons, and for the priests to have one or more concubines is more tolerable than to marry. But this topic of celibacy is treated at length in a subsequent part of this work.

The second volume is chiefly devoted to the examination of "THE GOVERNMENT OF THE CHURCH OF ROME." The claims of Romanists, that theirs is a church of Christ, as well as their arrogant pretensions to be the only true church, are subjected to scrutiny. By a skillfully constructed Scriptural argument it is demonstrated that not only their exclusive claims to unity and catholicity, but their pretensions as a Christian church are fictitious and false, for they are destitute of the Scriptural marks of the church of Christ, while they present unquestionable evidence of being a "synagogue of Satan." Their boasted unity, sanctity, catholicity, and apostolicity, are all severally considered, and on each of these topics a vast amount of evidence is produced, and from their own acknowledged standards, too, which goes to establish the position that Rome has not the slightest claim to either of these attributes. Her *unity*, so much vaunted, may be seen in her ever-changing body of divinity, no less than five distinct systems having been successively in the ascendent, viz., the Lombardic, scholastic, monastic, mixed or intermediate, and the Jesuitic ; and of each of these systems, essentially various, there have been numerous sects, whose bitter conflicts on cardinal questions have always divided and distracted the church. Her *unity* has never had other than a nominal existence, even in respect to the "rule of faith," nor any other portion of doctrine or discipline, as we have already seen. Witness their pope and anti-pope, the one at Rome, and the other at Avignon, in France, in the fourteenth century, when Urban and Clement reciprocally denounced each other ; and to this day the infallible church of unity has not been able to decide which was the lawful pope. See also the subsequent conflict between different popes reigning at the same time, excommunicating and anathematizing each other during the celebrated

western schism, which continued for fifty years. Popes and councils have since been at open war with each other, and schisms have succeeded each other for centuries, in reference to the relative powers of popes and councils, as well as to the jurisdiction of both. But it were an endless task even to enumerate the points which disprove the boast of Romish unity.

As to her *sanctity*, we shall seek for it in vain, for neither popes, cardinals, bishops, priests, monks, nuns, nor Jesuits, have sustained a uniform, or even general character for morality, much less sanctity, and if Romish historians themselves are worthy of credit, all these classes of ecclesiastics, from the popes down, have been notoriously profligate and wicked in their lives. Nor can it be otherwise than the ancient maxim would teach, "like priests, like people," for the doctrines and morals of the Church of Rome as such, have never guarded her sanctity, but, on the contrary, her indulgences have ever polluted her holiest places with crime.

Her *catholicity* is shown to be an impious and absurd pretension, in her sense and use of the term. Neither as to place, time, nor faith, is the Romish Church catholic. The author justly remonstrates against this name being applied by Protestants conventionally, or by any concession to the Romish Church, and contends for the use of the terms, popish and papist, as their true designation.

Her *apostolicity* is next discussed, and here the author treats at large upon succession in general; upon the exclusive pretension of Rome; upon the succession of Christianity independent of Rome; and upon the validity of the Protestant succession. His enlightened views on these several branches of the inquiry are presented, with the evidence on which he relies, in a manner which dissipates the obscurity which both Rome and other pretenders to exclusive and apostolic succession have contributed to gather about it, and he amply sustains the true Protestant doctrine on this topic. He examines and explodes the claims of Rome to antiquity for her peculiar dogmas, by indisputable proofs of their novelty. In short, all the several pretensions of Romanism, including its miracles, infallibility, &c., are investigated by the author in a style and spirit which will commend his arguments to every intelligent reader, as worthy of his respect and confidence.

The "GENERAL COUNCILS" furnish the theme for an entire chapter: their nature, number, requisites, authority, as well as their origin and use, are severally discussed and explained. The history of all such is here briefly presented, with the character and merits of each; and the author has here furnished a



vast amount of valuable information, which will be appreciated by the reader.

The "SUPREMACY OF THE POPE" is the next great feature of Romanism which the author examines, and he has devoted to this single subject eleven chapters, including two hundred and twenty-four pages. As on kindred topics, the first and greatest difficulty to be encountered is, that of convicting Romanists of any fixed opinions from which they cannot retreat by evasion, when they are shown to be heretical. The policy of Rome, even in the Council of Trent, was, as it has ever been, to avoid committing herself on the subject of supremacy, by any definite or explicit declaration of sentiment concerning either the nature or extent of the pope's supremacy. The necessity for caution and reserve on this cardinal doctrine, arises from the risk of coming into conflict with the authority of kings, or the reigning civil power in the state. It is only under governments which are in the immediate vicinity of Rome, or who are in allegiance to the papal see, that restraint is laid aside, and the ascription of universal supremacy, in temporal as well as spiritual things, is openly avowed, as belonging of divine right to the pope. That this is the doctrine of Romanists, however mystified or concealed, is established by numerous citations from their standard authors, as well as proofs of its exercise recorded in history. Next we are furnished with the evidence that during many ages different popes have claimed this absolute power over all persons, in all matters spiritual and temporal, as illustrated by their deposition of kings, absolving subjects from their oath of allegiance, and the like. But as a commentary on their unity and infallibility, the author cites the testimonies against this doctrine, denying the supremacy of the pope in temporal things, different views being expressed in different countries, and under different governments, as the policy of Rome finds tributary to her interests. But that such is, nevertheless, the true doctrine of Rome wherever she dare avow it, is demonstrated beyond the possibility of successful contradiction: while it is freely admitted that in relation both to temporal and spiritual supremacy there have been a variety of conflicting opinions, and that many Roman Catholic writers have utterly denied the pope's supremacy as being absolute, either in temporal or in spiritual things. It is certain, moreover, that for these denials, many have been anathematized and excommunicated by the popes themselves, whose supremacy they were thus constrained to feel, notwithstanding the denials of its existence in their creed. All the contrariety of opinions on this topic will be found stated at length, and the author

knows how to use these for his purpose, as the reader of these volumes will not fail to perceive.

But in pursuing this discussion, the definition given by Romanists of their doctrine of the pope's supremacy is taken as the basis of criticism, in which they all concur, and which none of them can disclaim without being a heretic, by consent of all who are not enemies to the apostolical see. This is found in the Acts of the Council of Florence, and Eugenius IV., and is also set forth in similar terms in the creeds, catechisms, bulls, and the oaths of their ecclesiastics. And as they profess to derive the universal spiritual supremacy from St. Peter by succession, the author lays down the following propositions for his argument:—

“1st. That Peter did not possess or exercise a primacy of superiority in power, command, or jurisdiction, over the other apostles; or, Peter had not by our Lord's appointment, or by divine right, supremacy over the other apostles.

“2d. That the primacy of Peter, of whatever kind it was, could not be transferred to others.

“3d. That Peter was not bishop of Rome.

“4th. That the bishops of Rome have not a universal supremacy over the whole church, according to God's appointment.

“5th. That all ecclesiastical presidencies, or subordinations of some bishops or chief pastors over others in spiritual matters, were introduced merely by human ordinances, and established by law and custom for prudential reasons, according to the exigencies of times and circumstances, and not by divine appointment.

“6th. That the supremacy of the pope is a usurpation, which will appear by tracing it out in its origin, progress, and establishment.

“7th. That the popes of Rome since Peter's time, in fact, have not possessed or exercised the several prerogatives, or branches of power, embraced in the supremacy of the pope.”

We regard these propositions as skillfully constructed, so as to embody the gist of the whole subject of the supremacy, including the entire fabric of succession as held and taught by Romanists, and by semi-papists under the Protestant name. And in their discussion the author has developed the extent of his own inherent powers, as well as the ample resources which he has at command. It is not sufficient to say that each of his propositions is impreguably established by ample and conclusive evidence, drawn from unquestionable and standard authorities, and sustained by reason and argument; for he has also demolished every vestige of this Babylonish heresy, and overturned the lying fables and forgeries so

long palmed upon mankind as miraculous attestations to their apostolical claims. And the reader will find the prerogatives of the pope, including his supremacy, to have been startling novelties in the history of the church, when first introduced; and their origin and invention are here traced, and proved by unimpeachable testimony to bear date many centuries after the apostolic age. So that neither Peter nor Paul ever dreamed of the power or prerogatives now professedly derived from their office, notwithstanding their immediate divine commission from the Lord, and the "signs of an apostle" which accompanied them and their fellows of the primitive apostolic college. A homily is here read, adapted to enlighten certain worshipers of antiquity and fancied successors of the apostles at Oxford, quite as much as their kindred of the papacy. In our notice of this portion of the work before us, we find our limits impose a restraint we can scarcely tolerate, but we must submit.

The work closes by a discussion of the doctrines, usages, &c., of the Church of Rome concerning "CELIBACY" and the "WORSHIP OF THE SAINTS." In considering the former of these, we have an able and Scriptural illustration of the essential heresy of their doctrines concerning the sanctity of virginity, and the unchastity of marriage. Their vows, imposed on multitudes, are proved to be in violation of the laws both of God and nature; and here we have a manly and honest exposure of the immoralities which are the legitimate result. The whole subject of clerical celibacy is discussed, their vindication of its institution is theoretically and practically refuted; accompanied by an elaborate argument against the celibacy of the clergy, which for point and force is superior to any it has been our happiness to see, and in which the author demonstrates that this doctrine alone involves the Church of Rome in the heinous guilt of heresy and apostasy, and is a practical renunciation of Christianity for heathenism. But the licentiousness flowing from this doctrine of celibacy is here shown to have been co-extensive with its reception, and the proofs are adduced from their own acknowledged authorities. The celibacy of the monks and nuns is next discussed, and its legitimate fruits as practically exemplified for centuries, together with the stupendous oppressions, cruelties, and crimes which have been proved by irrefragable testimony, are here the subject of remark and rebuke. And the author does not forget to allude in terms of just animadversion to the evidences of similar iniquity in our own nunneries of America, while yet Protestants are still so infatuated as to thrust their own daughters for education into these styres of pollution, and place their manners,



morals, and religion in the charge of these "sisters," whose very touch is contamination; and congeniality with whom ought to be regarded by such as a worse calamity than death, because inflicting a moral ruin of both body and soul, for this world and the next.

The worship of saints, and the kind of worship due them, are next discussed, and the impiety and absurdity of the Romanist practice in this respect are exhibited by examples of their prayers and praises, by which it is manifest not only that it is contrary to the Scriptures, and the example of the primitive church, but equally so that the saints are made intercessors, their advocacy and merits relied upon, and while the saints are deified, the worship of God is materialized by the homage paid to saints; and here the criminal idolatry of Rome is demonstrated by ample evidence found in the solemn forms of her ritual; the worship of saints and angels being authoritatively enjoined to the exclusion of Christ as the one sole mediator between God and man. This is justly charged with the guilt of antichristian idolatry or demon worship, and is among the palpable heresies and abominations of the "mystery of iniquity."

Such is a brief outline of the contents of the volumes before us, and we only regret that our space, and, not less, our lack of ability, have prevented our doing adequate justice to the author of this meritorious and original work. If we could impart to the reader a measure of the interest, instruction, and profit which we ourselves have derived from the perusal of this "Delineation," we might be better content with this review. All we can hope to do, however, is to awaken a desire to possess and peruse these volumes of Dr. Elliott, by furnishing a glance at their real merits. And we cannot withhold the acknowledgment, that besides the fund of knowledge we have derived from the work under notice, much of which we have heretofore sought in vain among writers on the papal controversy, we have arisen from the perusal of these pages with a more confirmed and undying conviction of the stupendous frauds, impostures, and heresies of the Romish apostasy, as well as a firmer faith in "the sure word of prophecy," and a still more enduring confidence in the Rock of our salvation. Indeed, we doubt whether any intelligent Roman Catholic, be he priest or layman, could read the evidence this work has accumulated, without respecting the author for his candor, and reverencing him for his learning and ability, whatever might be the invulnerable prejudice of his Romish education. And how any man can read it without the conviction that popery in the abstract and concrete is corrupt,

demoralizing, infamous, and false, exceeds our powers of comprehension.

But we desire the extensive circulation of these volumes as a timely antidote to the devices of Romanism, by which popish priests are annually making converts to their creed; for, with the expose here made of the intellectual imbecility and moral obliquity intrinsically identical with the system, we cannot but think that any inquirer would be safe from all their artifices at proselytism. For after becoming acquainted, in the light of this work, with the anti-christian and anti-American character of popery; after perusing here the proofs that the pope and his minions are the instruments in a wide-spread conspiracy against human liberty and the truth of God; and contemplating the evidence of the idolatry, arrogance, blasphemy, forgery, falsehood, hypocrisy, imposture, and licentiousness, inherent in the papacy, and inseparable from it; a man might defy a whole army of Jesuits with the weapons he will find in this armory of truth. And the Protestant readers of these volumes, especially our brethren in the Christian ministry, who shall make themselves familiar with their contents, will be prepared to resist successfully every onset of the Romish priesthood, and be qualified to do battle against this antichrist personified, under whatever disguise or transformation the ingenuity of Jesuitism may assume.

Finally, all who truly estimate the unspeakable blessings of the Reformation, and who are not unworthy of the name of Protestant, while they are here taught the nature of those damnable heresies which our fathers resisted unto the death of martyrdom, "striving unto blood," will find within them a measure of that spirit of Christian patriotism and fidelity which glowed in the bosoms of those whose blood is well said to have been "the seed of the church." Such, after reading these volumes, will be constrained to feel, that it were better for our country and the world that another universal deluge should overwhelm and destroy from the earth every living thing, than that popery should ever be permitted to trample down Christian liberty beneath the iron hoof of papal despotism, or her infidelity drive the ploughshare of ruin through the institutions of Protestant Christianity. Better far, that the earth should yawn, and swallow the myriads of our race, ingulging all in one common grave.

We close our review by the expression of our thanks to the Rev. Dr. Elliott for these timely and admirable volumes, from which we have gleaned, with pleasure and profit to ourselves, these crumbs from his loaf, that our readers may have a taste for

the perusal of the work, whence they have been gathered. The author has rendered a service to the church and the world, which the Protestant community can only repay by their gratitude, but which will find an ample recompense at "the resurrection of the just."

R.

---

ART. VII.—1. *The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review*. No. lix, July, 1841, and No. lx, October, 1841. London.

2. *The New-York Review*. No. xix, January, 1842. New-York.

THE Quarterlies at the head of this article are known as holding a high rank among a class of publications which are molding the opinions and forming the character of the present age. Of their respective literary merits it is not our purpose at present to speak, as they may be presumed to be sufficiently known and appreciated by such as will feel any considerable interest in this article.

We employ these works in this paper for the purpose of presenting the present position of the great controversy now in progress among *Churchmen*. We refer to the controversy moved by the Oxford divines in relation to certain principles which they have dignified with the general appellation of *Catholicity*.

When the Oxford Tracts began to excite public attention in this country, some said they were of popish tendency; and others going further, wisely judged that they were the work of real Romanists in disguise. Upon the character and tendency of the doctrines set forth in these publications, even Churchmen themselves, both in England and in this country, differed in opinion; some receiving the principles they advocate, and others rejecting them; the former denying, and the latter asserting that they are adverse to the fundamental principles of the English Church—that they constitute a wide and fatal departure from the doctrines of the Reformation.

The discussion has progressed, and the tendencies of the *new theology* have developed themselves, until they are no longer dimly seen; indeed, they are now openly avowed and vindicated. Many good Churchmen in both countries, who at first doubted, and even denied, that the Tractarians intended any innovations upon the doctrines of the English reformers, have at length become so thoroughly inducted into their principles of *Catholicity* that they are



ready to give up the fathers of the English Church as dissenters, if not as the worst of heretics.

The Oxford divines now isolate themselves wholly from the great Protestant family, and fearlessly class themselves with papists and other corrupt Christian communions. With them the word *Protestant* is synonymous with *dissenter*, and *Catholic* stands for the divinely authorized form of Christianity, embracing the Romish communion, the eastern churches, and the English Church, (not as it is exactly, but) as it ought to be.

The state of parties at Oxford is thus described in the Critic :—

“It is fit that the world should know how Oxford does most naturally divide itself; what are the two most decided hues. There are people who dream of an orthodox party in the university, as distinct from what we venture to call the Catholic. There are some also who dream of a so-called evangelical party, of numbers and strength. But these are dreams; comfortable dreams, perhaps, but still dreams. Neither of these parties exists. There may be a few men who separately, indistinctly, and waveringly, hold views that might be so described; but we appeal to all who know Oxford, whether it does in fact divide itself naturally into more than *two* descriptions or tendencies; those who are zealous for Catholic verities, and those who are indifferent to all doctrine as such. And if any shall tell us that they see in the former division the *promise* of popery, we can safely reply that we can produce in the latter the *earnests* of Socinianism.”—*British Critic*, July No., p. 233.

Now if the Critic has given us a faithful statement of the condition of things at Oxford—if indeed the university, which a century since gave birth to Methodism, is now divided between self-styled *Catholics* and *Socinians*, the case is a very sad one. And what can be expected from the English hierarchy, when her emporium of learning, of philosophy, and of divinity is shared between two grand and fatal corruptions of Christianity? But we must proceed with our design, which is, to give specimens that go to show the real ground which the Oxford divines now occupy.

Article I., in the July number of the Critic, purports to be a review of Bishop Jewell's Apology for the Church of England; but is, in fact, a review of the bishop himself. The object of the reviewer seems to be to derogate from the fair fame of this distinguished prelate, by showing that he was essentially *anti-Catholic*. His facts no intelligent reader will be disposed to doubt, but his reasoning upon those facts none but pseudo-Catholics, that is, real papists, will for a moment admit.

The reviewer begins with dismal moanings over the “angry struggle” which “has been the means of ‘dividing against itself’

the kingdom which should be united against the world," and the sad "necessity of a remedy so desperate—the penalty of a judgment so fearful, as the Reformation." It is lamentable, indeed, if the pope is to be regarded as the *centre of unity* to the Christian church, as the successor of St. Peter, and the vicar of Christ, that the English reformers should so far have forgotten their allegiance to Christ, and their regard for the unity of his mystical body, as to have occasioned a most fatal schism in the holy, indivisible, Catholic Church, and brought upon British Christians "a judgment so fearful as the Reformation."

But if, as the reformers supposed, Rome had corrupted the Christian doctrine and worship, and assumed the character of *antichrist*, the case is somewhat different. Then, indeed, the Reformation was not a separation among "Christian brethren," but a separation between "him that believeth and an infidel," between "the temple of God and idols."

Lest our readers should suppose our conclusions too hastily drawn, when we represent the Critic as an enemy to the Reformation, we will give him a portion of the evidence presented in the compass of two pages of the review under consideration. The reviewer says,—

"Of course union of the whole church under one visible government is abstractedly the most perfect state. We were so united, and now are not.—These three hundred years, we and Rome have been fighting about the question of precedence in the schism; the while we, at least, have too much lost sight of the melancholy and startling fact, that *we are divided*.—An evil, however, surely, at any rate, it is; a most grievous penalty upon sin *somewhere*; upon the corruption which provoked, or the sacrilege which assailed, or both together.—We talk of the 'blessings of emancipation from the papal yoke,' and use other phrases of a like bold and undutiful tenor.—Whether this true freedom, this freedom consistent with the most unquestioning obedience, where obedience is due, has come to us with the Reformation, we will not here discuss. Of course we believe that it has not; and that, free though we may still be in theory, we have yet practically lost by the change, even in point of freedom. But a 'yoke,' especially a spiritual yoke, is of itself no necessary evil. We *trust*, of course, that active and visible union with the see of Rome is not of the essence of a church; at the same time, we are deeply conscious that, in lacking it, far from asserting a right, we forego a great privilege."—*British Critic*, July No., pp. 2, 3.

Is any thing further necessary to exhibit our reviewer's abhorrence of "the Reformation," and his friendship for "Rome?" Surely it cannot be long ere he will wash his hands of the practice, as well as the principles of a system of such "bold and undutiful

tenor" as the Reformation, and become a most dutiful son of "my lord god the pope!"

But after perusing "this train of thought, more or less melancholy—awakened by an examination of some of the writings of Bishop Jewell," the reviewer takes the following notice of these writings:—

"The very titles of Bishop Jewell's works are enough to frighten the reader, who is in search of edification. We have an 'Apology,' and a 'Defense of an Apology;' a 'Challenge,' and a 'Vindication of a Challenge;' a 'Preface in answer to a Detection of foul Errors,' a 'Protest against a Return of Untruths.' And even works of a more promising exterior, such as 'Sermons' and 'Commentaries,' are of a no less inflammatory substance. It was once observed, in the pages of this Review, concerning certain writers, that, whatever they touch, turns, in their hands, to evidence. Certainly it may be said of Bishop Jewell, that whatever he touches, turns to controversy. His works are like nouns defective in all cases but the accusative."—*British Critic*, July No., p. 3.

We have recently been so fortunate as to possess ourselves of a copy of these terrible "writings." Our copy is a heavy folio, in black letter, and of the edition of 1609. This work has long been almost unknown, except in European libraries, and has been sought after by the learned as a literary curiosity. We have already, so far, availed ourselves of its contents as to be able to give the reviewer a little additional light upon several topics of importance. There is one of the bishop's "nouns defective" that the reviewer has overlooked in his catalogue, of which we will here give some account. The following is its title:—A Replie unto M. Harding's Answer: by perusing whereof, the discreet and diligent reader may easily see the weake and unstable grounds of the Romish religion, which of late hath been accounted Catholic. By JOHN JEWELL, Bishop of Sarisburie. 3. Esd. 4. Magna est veritas et prevalet—Great is truth and prevaieth. Ex Edicto Imperatorum Valentin, et Martiani, in council Chalcedon. Actione 3. Qui post semel inventam Veritatem aliud quærit, Mendacium quærit, non Veritatem—After the truth is once found, whosoever seeketh further, he seeketh not for the truth, but for a lie. London: printed by John Norton, printer to the kings most excellent majestie. 1609." This great "noun defective" of five hundred and fifteen heavy folio pages is as clearly in the "accusative" as any that the good reviewer has been pleased to name. The true reason why these masterly productions so "frighten" our reviewer, and are so "defective" in his eye, is that they lay a deadly blow at the grand errors of Romanism;



fully unveil "the mystery of iniquity," and call back the church to the true foundation—the records of eternal truth.

The origin of this great work was as follows:—On March 30th, 1560, the Sunday before Easter, the bishop preached a sermon at St. Paul's Cross, on 1 Cor. xi, 23, in which he gave out the following famous "challenge:"—

"If any learned man of our adversaries, or all the learned men that be alive, be able to bring any one sufficient sentence out of any old Catholic doctor, or father, or general council, or Holy Scripture, or any *one* example in the primitive church, whereby it may clearly and plainly be proved during the first six hundred years: 1. That there was at any time any private masses in the world; 2. Or that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind; 3. Or that the people had their common prayer in a strange tongue which they understood not; 4. Or that the bishop of Rome was then called a universal bishop, or the head of the universal church; 5. Or that the people were then taught to believe that Christ's body is really, substantially, corporally, carnally, or naturally in the sacrament; 6. Or that his body is, or may be in a thousand places or more at one time; 7. Or that the priest did then hold up the sacrament over his head; 8. Or that the people did then fall down and worship it with godly honor; 9. Or that the sacrament was then, or now ought to be hanged up under a canopy; 10. Or that in the sacraments after the words of consecration there remained only the accidents and shows without the substance of bread and wine; 11. Or that the priests divided the sacrament into three parts, and afterward received it themselves alone; 12. Or that whosoever had said the sacrament is a figure, a pledge, a token, or a remembrance of Christ's body, had therefore been adjudged for an heretic; 13. Or that it was lawful then to have thirty, twenty, fifteen, ten, or five masses said in the same church in one day; 14. Or that images were then set up in the churches, to the intent the people might worship them; 15. Or that the lay people were then forbidden to read the word of God in their own tongue; 16. Or that it was then lawful for the priest to pronounce the words of consecration closely, or in private to himself; 17. Or that the priest had the authority to offer up Christ unto his Father; 18. Or to communicate and receive the sacrament for another, as they do; 19. Or to apply the virtue of Christ's death and passion to any man by means of the mass; 20. Or that it was then thought a sound doctrine to teach the people that mass, *ex opere operato*, (that is, even for that it is said and done,) is able to remove any part of our sin; 21. Or that any Christian man called the sacrament of his Lord, his God; 22. Or that the people were then taught to believe that the body of Christ remaineth in the sacrament, as long as the accidents of the bread and wine remain there without corruption; 23. Or that a mouse, or any other worm, or beast may eat the body of Christ; (for so some of our adversaries have said and taught;) 24. Or that when Christ said, *Hoc est Corpus meum*, the word *hoc* pointed not to the bread, but to an *individuum vagum*, as some

of them say ; 25. Or that the accidents, or forms, or shows of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather the very bread and wine itself ; 26. Or that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ, that lieth hidden underneath it ; 27. Or that ignorance is the mother and cause of true devotion. The conclusion is, that I shall then be content to yield and subscribe."

The gauntlet thus fearlessly flung down, was taken up by Dr. John Harding, one of the Romish divines of Lovain, and the most learned of the college. This true son of the *ancient church* met this formidable list of propositions in consecutive order, and with genuine Romish logic. The bishop in his "Answer," according to the manner of conducting controversies in those times, first sets down the proposition as contained in the "Challenge," then gives Harding's argument at length, and finishes with his refutation. The whole is an exhibition of patient research and critical learning on the part of Bishop Jewell absolutely astonishing.

Bishop Jewell's Apology was originally written in Latin, and was subsequently translated into various languages, and freely circulated throughout Protestant Christendom. A modern translation, with a sketch of the author's life, and a preliminary discourse, by Isaacson, was published in London, 1825. This is a truly edifying volume, and is occasionally to be found in this country. The Apology was written by the request of the English bishops, and published by the authority of Queen Elizabeth, as a public confession of the faith of the Church of England, and of the reasons for not submitting to the authority of the Council of Trent. The Apology, together with the Defense, are executed on the same plan as the "Answer," and were held in such esteem that they were placed in the churches, to be consulted as the best exposition of the doctrines of the Church. But now, lo ! the very titles of these books, saying nothing of their contents, "frighten" our truly Catholic Churchmen all but out of their wits.

The reviewer gives us a sketch of the life of Bishop Jewell, the leading facts of which are the following :—He was born in 1522 at Buden, in Devonshire, and educated principally at Barnstaple. At the age of thirteen he was removed to the university, and admitted of Merton College, where he pursued his studies under the instructions of Mr. John Parkhurst, then fellow of the college, from whom he imbibed the principles of the Reformation. When Peter Martyr was appointed divinity professor at Oxford, Jewell became one of his most attentive hearers, and contracted an intimacy with that great *continental reformer*. He afterward accepted the small living of Sunningwell, near Oxford, to which he went on

foot every other Sunday, though he had a lameness which made such journeyings exceedingly painful. When *Catholic Mary* ascended the throne, to avoid the penalty of death, Jewell subscribed a recantation of the Protestant faith; but not feeling himself safe, he escaped, though with difficulty, by taking an unusual path, and finally succeeded in reaching Frankfort, where he found a number of foreign reformers and English refugees. The morning after his arrival he made a public confession of his fault from the pulpit. "Poor Jewell," says the Critic, "was deeply affected, and spake of his act in the language of bitter self-reproach." His old friend, Peter Martyr, took him to his house, and made him a companion until the accession of Elizabeth, when he returned to England, and became bishop of Salisbury, in which office he remained until his death.

But the reviewer is not at all "satisfied of the sufficiency of Jewell's *penance*." "Sudden restorations and unconditional absolutions," he tells us, "are no part of the Catholic system." The reviewer would have the "penance" characterized by the salutary, voluntary sufferings, of which there are so many notable examples in *the lives of the saints*. And yet he really thinks Jewell did not become an "apostate" by his act of subscription, but rather returned to "Catholic principles." Why he would have him suffer *penance* at all for such an act, seems a little difficult to determine.

The fact is, the reviewer denies that "what Ridley and Latimer maintained to the last, and what Jewell temporarily gave up, was *the truth*." And, consequently, he enters his protest against applying the term "martyrdom" to the death of the two former, as well as against applying that of "apostasy" to the subscription of the latter. Should the reader doubt whether we do our good Catholic reviewer justice, the following will be quite sufficient to satisfy him. He says,—

"Well; what we say is, that, to call the earlier reformers, martyrs, is to beg the question, which, of course, Protestants do not consider a question; but which no one pretending to the name of Catholic can for a moment think of conceding to them, viz., whether that, for which these persons suffered, were '*the truth*.'"—*British Critic*, July No., p. 14.

Now, if Ridley, and Latimer, and Cranmer did not suffer for "the truth," they suffered for a *lie*—for *heresy*: if so, they were not only not Christian martyrs, but were real *heretics*. And are our good Churchmen prepared to give up the writers of their articles, and their homilies, and the compilers of their Liturgy, as



*heretics*? But this is the dismal gulf to which Oxfordism legitimately leads them.

We will now give the reader the reviewer's explicit avowal of his position, and the light in which he and his party view the English reformers. He says,—

“There cannot, however, be a doubt, that, serious as are the impediments in the way of our speedy return, as a nation, to the ‘old paths,’ these impediments would be multiplied a hundred fold, were the Church of England to be considered as in any degree pledged to the private opinions, or individual acts, of her so-called reformers. One does not see how, in that case, persons, who feel, with Mr. Froude's editors, that the lines respectively, of Catholic antiquity and of the English Reformation (except so far as the genius of the latter has been overruled by influences extrinsic to the opinions and wishes of its promoters) are ‘*not only diverging, but opposed.*’”—*British Critic*, July No., p. 28.

The reviewer finally proceeds to admit, not only for himself, but for his party, what both Romanists and dissenters have asserted, but what Churchmen have, until recently, always denied, that the English reformers agreed substantially with those of the continent, and that both wholly rejected the Romish system of doctrine and discipline. After referring to the controversy upon this point, he says,—

“Quite lately a third party has sprung up, of persons who have the boldness to admit the substantial accuracy of the view which we have just now supposed, of the English Reformation and reformers; but who consider, nevertheless, that such a view is perfectly compatible with the strenuous maintenance of characteristically Catholic doctrine, and even with a dutiful attachment to our own branch of the Church. This party may be considered as represented in the Preface to the Second Part of Mr. Froude's Remains.

“One advantage, among others, of such a view, *if it will but hold*, strikes us as being that of its tendency to remove points of disunion, as well as to clear the ground of discussion, with very opposite parties; the Catholics of another communion, on the one hand, and the dissenters and advocates of Protestantism, on the other. One, among many, subjects of contention between members of the Anglican Church, and those exterior to it on both sides, or those who, though within it, incline, in sentiment, to bodies without it, has undoubtedly been that of the opinions of the English reformers. The Anglicans have ever been jealous of the reputation of these divines, and have accordingly resented the accounts given of them, from two opposite sides, with all the keenness of persons attacked in their tenderest point. Now, here is a view, (whether tenable or not,) which would enable us to allow all that Protestants can desire on the one hand, and Roman Catholics on the other, concerning the peculiar character of the reformers' opinions;

and he must, indeed, be a lover of controversy for its own sake, who does not turn with pleasure, in the midst of an arduous and unpromising struggle, to the prospect of a refuge at once so pleasant and so secure, so conducive to peace, yet so consistent with dignity, so happy in its present effects, and so promising in its bearing upon the future course of the engagement, as that of a *safe concession*. Here is a view, which has the rare, if not the singular, advantage, of presenting a point of union to those parties, who are united in little, if in any thing, else; the Protestant, the Anglican, and the Roman Catholic. In vain, from this time forth, shall the 'Record' serve up, week after week, choice morsels of Cranmer's Erastianism, or the 'Tablet' twit us (if so be) with Jewell's irreverence. Here is a view which promises us the power of upholding Pope Hildebrand and the see of St. Peter, for all the reformers denied the supremacy of the church; and of ministering in copes, for all they thought even surplices of the essence of antichrist!"—*British Critic*, July No., pp. 30, 31.

Further, to sustain himself in his position, the reviewer gives us in a note the celebrated passage from Froude's Remains, (vol. i, part i, p. 379,) as follows:—

"As to the reformers, I think worse and worse of them. Jewell was what you would in these days call an irreverent dissenter. His Defense of his Apology *disgusted me more than almost any work I have read.*"—*British Critic*, July No., p. 33.

Here then we see land: Cranmer was an Erastian; the English reformers were real Protestants; and the Anglican and the continental reformers were of the same school. Well, so let it be. The question now is, whether Churchmen will adhere to their glorious reformers and blessed martyrs, acknowledge the continental reformers, and consider themselves a part of the great Protestant family, or go over to Tractarianism, or as Mr. Froude and the reviewer would have it, to *ancient Catholicity*.

Finally, our reviewer proceeds to furnish several striking specimens of Jewell's Protestantism. These quotations are doubtless entirely conclusive, and had we space we should be happy to make large additions of equally appropriate passages.

"1. Concerning the apostolical succession, Jewell says,—'If it were certain that the religion and truth of God came by succession, and none otherwise, then were succession, whereof Mr. Harding hath told us so long a tale, a very good substantial argument of the truth. But Christ saith, In cathedra Moysi sedent Scribæ, &c., (by order of succession.) Annas and Caiaphas, touching succession, were as well bishops as Aaron and Eleazar. Of succession, St. Paul says, "After my departure, ravening wolves shall enter," &c. Therefore St. Hierome saith, Non sanctorum filii sunt qui tenent loca sanctorum.'"—*D. of A.*, p. 120. (*British Critic*, July No., p. 38.)

The reviewer quotes the edition of 1611, the pages of which agree with those of our copy, which is dated 1609. Again,—

“Elsewhere he says,—‘This is M. Harding’s holy succession, though faith fall, yet succession must hold. For unto such succession God hath bound the Holy Ghost. . . . M. Harding.—Are you not ashamed thus notoriously, and withal most slanderously, to belie that most blessed succession of the Church of Rome? . . . Jewell.—But St. Paul saith, “*Faith cometh* (not by succession, but) *by hearing*; and hearing cometh (not by legacy or inheritance from bishop to bishop, but) by the word of God.”’—*D. of A.*, p. 139.

“2. Concerning the sacraments, he says in the Apology,—‘We allow the sacraments, that is to say, certain holy signs and ceremonies which Christ would have us use, that by them he might *set before men’s eyes* the mysteries of our salvation, and might more strongly confirm faith, &c., and might seal his grace in our hearts. And these sacraments, *together with* Tertullian, Origen, Ambrose, (and a long catalogue of fathers,) we do call *figures, signs, marks, badges, prints, copies, forms, seals, signets, similitudes, patterns, representations, remembrances, and memories.*’”—*D. of A.*, p. 205. (*British Critic*, July No., p. 39.)

Upon this passage the reviewer proceeds:—

“Not a word, in this fluent enumeration, of the direct conveyance of divine grace by the sacraments. Not a hint at the mysterious virtue, the transforming, invigorating efficacy, which the natural elements acquire through the act of consecration, and of which they are the appointed media to the soul, no hinderance of unbelief or sin being interposed. Again observe what Archbishop Whately calls the ‘fallacy of reference;’ and what may be called also, the *fallacy of suppression*. Doubtless, all these fathers say, that the sacraments are significant and commemorative. But do they not also say, that they are operative, in every unresisting subject, of certain mysterious effects?

“Upon this Harding justly remarks, that Jewell’s view places the sacraments of the gospel on a par with the rites of Judaism. *Jewell admits it.* ‘The sacraments of the old law and of the new in truth and substance are all one. St. Paul saith, *Omnes eundem cibum comederunt.*’—P. 208. He thus implies that we receive Christ in the sacraments no otherwise than as the Israelites are said to have partaken of him in the wilderness. Might not the charge of Judaism, so liberally bestowed upon the Roman Catholics, be fitly retorted?”—*British Critic*, July No., p. 39.

We will give Harding’s positions and Jewell’s answer more at length, that the reader may be able more clearly to perceive what it is that the reviewer agrees with, on the one hand, and opposes, on the other.

Harding says,—

“This word, sacrament, signifies sometimes a holy thing, sometimes the sign of a holy thing, instituted by God. As it is taken for a sign



only, so it is found generally, not only in the new law, but also in the old law. But in the new law these signs, after a peculiar and special manner, be called sacraments, which do not only signify a holy thing, but also do sanctify and make holy those to whom they are adhibited, being such as by institution of Christ contain grace in them, and power to sanctify."

Again, he says,—

"Yet we mean that they [sacramental signs] contain grace, and power to sanctify, after such manner of speaking, as we say of potions and drinks prepared for sick persons, that they contain health, to the working whereof they be 'effectual.'—And as it is said of the sacraments, that they contain grace, so is it likewise said, that through their virtue, which they have by God's institution, they do not only signify (as by these defenders' doctrine that seemeth to be their special office) but also with signification *work* and *cause*, as an instrumental cause, the effect of that which they signifie."

Again,—

"What then? Will it follow, that because our sacraments do show that Christ is already come, therefore our sacraments give no grace? He that eateth Christ's flesh, sheweth his death, saith St. Paul; and he that eateth my flesh, saith Christ, hath life everlasting. Mark how our having of life goeth together with our showing of Christ's death: you divide these matters and make Christ's sacraments only to be shows."

The bishop's answer to the last passage above stands thus:—

"You have miscalled S. Paul, M. Harding; these are not his words: look better to your books, and see your error. If I had some part of your eloquence, I could cry out, as you do, *Falsifiers and corrupters of God's word*. S. Paul saith not, *He that eateth Christ's flesh, sheweth his death*. You deal untruly. Thus he saith: *As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, you shall show forth the Lord's death*. The bread of the sacrament is one thing, M. Harding; and the flesh of Christ is another. The bread entereth only into the bodily mouth: Christ's flesh entereth only into the soule. Without eating of that bread of the sacrament we may be saved: without eating Christ's flesh we can never be saved. S. Augustin saith precisely: *Qui non sumit Carnem Christi, non habet vitam, et qui eam sumit habet vitam, et eam utique eternam*: he that receiveth not the flesh of Christ, hath not life: and he that receiveth the same hath life, and that for ever. Again he saith: The sacrament is received of some unto life, of some unto destruction; but the thing itself, (that is, the flesh of Christ,) whereof the sacrament [or bread] is a sacrament, is received of all men unto life, and of no man unto destruction, whosoever shall be a partaker of it."—Pp. 205, 208, 209.

As to what the reviewer calls "the fallacy of reference," we are sorry to say, that he has exhibited a most striking instance of

this species of fallacy, in endeavoring to palm it upon Bishop Jewell. For the bishop shows, in instances quite too numerous for reference, that the ancient fathers represent the *figurative* character of the sacraments in language entirely inconsistent with the "operative" efficacy attributed to them by Romanists and such Churchmen as our reviewer. We give the following as one specimen out of a hundred of the bishop's arguments upon the point :—

"Let us see," says he, "in what sense the holy Catholic fathers have expounded these words of Christ, *This is my body*. First, Tertullian saith thus : *Christus acceptum Panem, et distributum Discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit dicendo : Hoc est corpus meum, hoc est Figura corporis mei* : Christ taking the bread and dividing it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, *This is my body*, that is to say, *This is a figure of my body*. S. Augustin saith : *Non dubitavit dominus dicere, hoc est corpus meum, cum daret Signum Corporis sui* : Our Lord doubted not to say, *This is my body*, when he gave a token of his body."

Again he quotes St. Augustin, as follows :—

"*Solet res, quæ significat, ejus rei nomine, quam significat nuncupari : hinc est, quod dictum est, Petra erat Christus. Non enim dicit, Petra significat Christum, Sed tanquam hoc esset, quod utique per substantiam non erat, sed per significationem.* The thing that signifieth is commonly called by the name of that thing that it signifieth. Therefore is it, that St. Paul saith : *The rock was Christ*. For he saith not, *The rock signified Christ*, (but, *The rock was Christ*,) as if the rock had been Christ indeed, whereas touching the substance it was not so, but so it was by signification."—*Defense*, p. 428.

Now we would most humbly desire to know where can be the chance for the reviewer's and Romish doctrine of the *opus operatum* in these special explanations ? It may be proved that these fathers say, "Christ's body is in the vessels," and the like, which would seem to imply the *real presence* in the sacrament. But the most that can be certainly concluded from such passages is, that these fathers have contradicted themselves. Jewell makes it appear probable that they intended to be understood figuratively in these bold expressions. And he furnishes a long list of parallel passages from these writers upon other subjects when their language is necessarily to be taken figuratively.

"Such amplifications," says the bishop, "and vehement and extraordinary speeches, notwithstanding, in some cases, they may be dangerous, yet oftentimes they seem necessary, the better to quicken the dullness and negligence of the people."—*Defense*, p. 275.

It can, indeed, be to no purpose for Romanists or Churchmen to multiply strong expressions from the fathers in relation to the

efficacy of sacramental signs, and the presence of Christ in those signs, when these fathers tell us explicitly that all such expressions are to be understood *figuratively*. It is the fallacy *petitio principii*, and is doing the greatest injustice to these writers. We are not the apologist of "the holy fathers," as they are called. They are very far from giving a certain sound upon the matters in controversy between us and so-called *Catholics*. But they should have their due, and the fathers of the English Church, who made so free use of them, should also have their due. It is, indeed, almost enough to provoke a smile to see such writers as our reviewer attempt to convict Bishop Jewell of ignorance or perversion of the fathers. No intelligent and unprejudiced reader, who will attentively peruse the writings of this prelate, will for a moment suspect him of either. This great defender of the English Church manifests a little too much confidence in the fathers; but in general it will be found that he uses them in *argumentum ad hominum*, where their authority is perfectly valid. And in this case he is not bound to prove that these fathers have always been consistent with themselves. If it indubitably appears that they ever, in any case, speak a language inconsistent with what are denominated *Catholic verities*, this is good and valid, in opposition to his opponent who claimed for these verities "*the unanimous consent of the fathers*." If it can be shown, ever so clearly, that they speak another language on other occasions, it affects not the cogency of the bishop's argument in the least. Still we maintain that the evidence is far from being conclusive, that the language of those fathers which is quoted by Jewell and Harding, ever necessarily implies the doctrine of the *real presence*, and the *sanctifying efficacy* of *sacramental signs*. They should certainly be allowed to interpret their own language; and when they tell us explicitly that the words which are supposed to imply the Romish doctrine are to be understood *figuratively*, should not this settle the question?

"3. The power of the keys. 'We say that the office of loosing consisteth in this point, that the minister *either by the preaching of the gospel*, offereth the merits of Christ, and full pardon to such as have lowly and contrite hearts, and do unfeignedly repent themselves. Or, when the same minister . . . doth reconcile (offenders) . . . to the company and unity of the faithful. . . . And touching the keys . . . we with *Chrysostom* say, they be the knowledge of the Scriptures . . . with *Tertullian* we say, they be the interpretation of the law, and with *Eusebius* we call them the word of God.'—*Apol.*, c. 6, 7. (*British Critic*, July No., pp. 39, 40.)



With this evidence before him, the reader will readily concede that Bishop Jewell was no Catholic, according to the reviewer's notions of Catholicity.

"The last quotation" the reviewer is disposed to "inflict" upon his "readers," concerns a person, rather than a doctrine.

"Harding had said,—'It was a most gracious gift of God that he gave this Thomas [à Becket] grace to die for his honor.'

"Answer,—'For his honor, say you? Now, for shame, Mr. Harding! . . . . The very true cause of Becket's death was his ambition, and vanity, *and wilful maintenance of manifest wickedness in the clergy* (!) to the great dishonor of God's holy name.'—*D. of A.*, p. 295.

"One is hardly restrained from indignation on hearing the blessed saints and martyrs of the Most High thus slandered by these teachers of yesterday!"—*British Critic*, July No., p. 42.

So it has come to this. The English reformers who died for maintaining the precious truths of the gospel, in opposition to Roman superstition and idolatry, *are not martyrs to the truth*; but the notorious Becket, who had rendered himself so odious by his aspiring to an independence of the civil power, and assuming to protect the licentious priesthood from the civil penalties which their crimes had merited, as to subject himself to private assassination, is canonized by *members of the Church of England* as one of "the blessed saints and martyrs of the Most High!" A great pity, indeed, it is that Churchmen of the present day had not a tythe of the learning and piety which was possessed by their reformers and fathers, whom they now contemptuously repudiate as "teachers of yesterday."

A leading question between Catholics and Protestants is, whether the anxious inquirer should go to the *Bible* or to the *Church* to know what he must do to be saved. Both agree that the Scriptures contain the mind of the Spirit, but the question is how the sense of the Scriptures is to be ascertained. Protestants say, every one, after using all the means in his power to find the right meaning of God's word, is to judge for himself what that meaning is. Catholics, on the other hand, say that the *Church decides authoritatively* as to the sense of Holy Scripture. Dr. Harding says, "Such sense of the Scriptures is to be taken for Scripture, which the Holy Ghost hath taught the Church." The *British Critic* says,—

"We will only mention one more consideration, and so conclude this branch of our subject. *We maintain that the true sense of Scripture is handed down from age to age by transmission; and that the witnesses to it profess no more than to deliver what they have received; also that private individuals depend more or less on the word of those*

*more holy* than themselves, who assure us that they go on continually to find greater accordance between the written and the unwritten word."—*British Critic*, October No., p. 344.

Here is a perfect correspondence between the Romish and the English Catholic as to what is the Scripture. According to them the *interpretation* which the Church puts upon the language of the Bible "is to be taken for Scripture." In accordance with this fundamental principle, both these classes of Catholics teach us that *private judgment* is to be exercised upon the inquiries, *Where is the Church? Who are the authorized teachers?* But not upon the question, *What has God taught us in his word?*

"We conceive then," says the Critic, "that, on the whole, the notion of gaining religious truth for ourselves by our private inquiry, whether by reading or thinking, whether by studying Scripture or other books, has no broad sanction in Scripture, is not impressed upon us by its general tone, nor enjoined in any of its commands. The great question which it puts before private judgment is, Who is God's prophet? and where? Who is to be considered the voice of the holy Catholic and apostolic Church?"—*British Critic*, July No., p. 116.

When we commenced this article we intended to give the reader several specimens of the efforts made by the Critic to show the unity of sentiment between the Romish and the English Churches. We find, however, that our limits will not permit us fully to carry out this design. The ground which is taken, is, that "they are one in faith, so far forth as they are viewed in their essential apostolical character," and "they are in discord, so far as their respective children and disciples have overlaid them with the errors of their own individual minds."—*July No.*, p. 120.

The view here presented is not only wholly at war with the representations of Cranmer, Jewell, Jackson, &c., but is also utterly irreconcilable with the homilies of the Church and the thirty-nine articles, adopted by the convocation and parliament, and sanctioned by "the supreme head on earth of the Church." For all these authorities, which surely are not to be regarded as "the errors of individual minds," represent the Romish Church as having *corrupted the faith, in points essential to salvation*. Now, when the Critic will show us that in all matters of importance there is a perfect agreement between the thirty-nine articles and the decrees of the Council of Trent, he will have approached a reconciliation of some of the great contrarieties between the faith of the two churches, as that faith is embodied and stands before the world. Let the reader but refer back to the twenty-seven articles embraced in Bishop Jewell's famous challenge, and he will then be able to determine

whether the Church of Rome and the Church of England were "one in faith" in the days of the reformers. Indeed, if these two communions now agree in faith, one or the other must have undergone some radical changes within the three last centuries.

But we must now come nearer home. We shall next inquire, briefly, into the state of the controversy in question in our own country. In doing this we shall principally confine ourselves to a review of Palmer's Treatise on the Church in the *New-York Review* for January, 1842.

The object of the reviewer seems to be to present, in rather a guarded manner, the leading points involved in the Tractarian controversy. And while he approves of the "Oxford theology" in general, he is wise enough to admit that there are some "floating straws of error" attached to the system. As to the leading point in debate the reviewer says,—

"We are well satisfied that the question of the Church is THE question that lies at the foundation of all minor questions among professing but divided Christians, and that its Scriptural and charitable solution is that which will go foremost, and pave the way most solidly to reunion among them."—*New-York Review*, pp. 102, 103.

In this view we agree with the reviewer, at least so far as concerns the questions which arise between Churchmen and other Christians. "The question of *the Church*," doubtless, "lies at the foundation" of the whole controversy upon the right of ordination, and the valid administration of the ordinances, claimed by those who take the Protestant ground. And yet it seems to us that the reviewer has done but little toward settling this great question. The definition of the Church, given by Gibson, viz., "A spiritual corporation having *a cure of souls*, and with *a right of tythes*," the reviewer says, "is the definition of an established Church:" "that of the thirty-nine articles," viz., "A congregation of faithful men," &c., is "*ecclesiastical* rather than *theological*," as "the phrase 'congregation' is uncatholic;" and that of "the Douay Catechism," viz., "the Church is *the* congregation of all the faithful under Jesus Christ, their visible head, and his *vicar upon earth, the pope*," is also made extremely "uncatholic" by "the latter clause." He finally comes to Mr. Palmer's definition, which he considers opposed to "the error of bigotry," on the one hand, and that of "the worldly reasoner," on the other.

"To the one his language is: 'The Church means the whole society of Christians throughout the world, including all who profess their belief in Christ, and who are subject to lawful pastors;' to the



other: 'The Church of Christ is not formed by the mere voluntary association of individuals, but by divine grace operating either by miracle or by ordinary means of divine institution.'—P. 116.

Now, how far the definition of Mr. Palmer goes toward settling the controversy, we will let the intelligent reader judge. Indeed, all good Protestants will, without hesitation, agree with every word of it. But it settles nothing at all. What these "divine institutions" are, and what constitutes "lawful pastors," yet remain in question. And in this state our reviewer leaves "*the question*," upon which so much depends.

But "*the right of the Church to teach authoritatively the rational and choosing mind*," (see pp. 109, 110,) is assumed by our reviewer as explicitly as by the British Critic, or any of that class of divines from whom he takes his cue. We notice the mere fact here, of the agreement between our reviewer and the Tractarians, as we proceed in course, without, at present, making any remarks upon the principle assumed.

"The first agitating question" which he notices in his author "relates to 'salvation in the Church only.'" And this doctrine, the reviewer says, his author makes out "to be the uniform decision, even of all dissenting churches:" in proof he gives us quotations from Calvin, Owen, and Robert Barclay. As the reviewer quotes Mr. Palmer with approbation, he assumes his disingenuousness. Had the reviewer been disposed to do justice, both to his author and the dissenters, whose language he quotes, he would have notified the reader that Mr. Palmer and these dissenters, by *the Church*, mean very different things; the one understanding *an external and visible society*, and the other, *the company of God's chosen people*, or all *true believers*. But not to insist further upon this point, we should have been highly gratified to learn that the reviewer does not "concur in this language as either the most Scriptural or the most rational," did he not leave all who are not attached to what he calls "*the Church*" in the condition of "heathen." His views are condensed in this short sentence, "To the heathen belongs his own probation." Perhaps "dissenting churches" should thank this kind reviewer for giving them, in common with *other* "heathen," a "probation," and not consigning them to unconditional reprobation, as his author does.

We shall next notice the claims which the reviewer sets up for the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. To lay the foundation of his superstructure, he deduces a fundamental principle from his former reasoning, though he seems to proceed in the business with some little trepidation. He says,—

"Among the perilous propositions (popularly speaking) deduced from these principles is, that there cannot be in the same portion of Christendom more than one Church rightfully claiming the title of THE Church of Christ, that is, not in schism. Altar cannot rise against altar without sin. Thus, in the realm of England, the Church of Rome was and is *schismatic*, having intruded after the Reformation with its rival altar for the first time, about the year 1570, when members began first to fall off from the Church of England, encouraged and stimulated by emissaries sent forth from Rome."—P. 124.

Upon the principle here laid down the reviewer proceeds to show that the "Protestant Episcopal Church in America is the only one against which the charge of schism cannot, for one moment, rest—whether we look to recognized ecclesiastical principles or to the well-known facts of history."—P. 125. The reviewer's "ecclesiastical principles" are above stated, and whoever else has "recognized" their legitimacy, certainly we have not, nor shall we ever do so until we submit to the supremacy of the pope.

But to his "facts of history." These are, *first*, that "the first actual settlement" made upon "these coasts," (that of Jamestown, Virginia, 1607,) "was under the express authority and guidance of the Church." Now this historical fact can have no bearing upon the question, unless it be upon the principle that the branch of the Church first established upon a mighty continent, though it consist of a mere handful, hid in a small nook or corner, has the exclusive right to ecclesiastical jurisdiction over the whole continent for ever. This is certainly a very grave matter, and must, we suppose, be capable of being settled by some ancient council, or some canon of the Catholic Church. We would most respectfully ask our good reviewer to give his authority for this sweeping principle in ecclesiastical polity. And he will also do well to inquire whether such a principle would be limited by natural barriers or civil boundaries. Whether the bishop of London, because Jamestown was assigned to him as a part of his charge, had an ecclesiastical claim to New-England, and the territory west of the Allegany; and, if so, would he not also claim Mexico and South America? Here our wise reviewer will probably say, South America and Mexico were pre-occupied by the Roman Catholics, and as they are acknowledged a legitimate branch of the Catholic Church, they have the right to those countries. Very well. What, then, hinders their having the previous right to all North America? Would not ecclesiastical right travel northward as well as southward? And will our reviewer tell us whether such a thing as an *isthmus* is a barrier that

ecclesiastical jurisdiction cannot pass, while it can pass rivers, scale mountains, and mock all civil boundaries ?

A *second* historical fact upon which our reviewer relies is, that "the apostolical gift—the episcopate—was received from the mother Church in 1784 and 1787, which gave to the American Church an unquestioned independent national existence as a branch of the Church of Christ," "the actual ecclesiastical establishment" of "the Church of Rome" being "later by several years." The result to which our reviewer's historical facts lead him, is as follows :—

"That, inasmuch as the Church of Rome *followed* the Church of England with its episcopate, while the Independents and dissenters had *no* episcopate to oppose to it, that the Church Catholic, therefore, in its apostolic form, was earliest established in these United States, first as colonies necessarily, and then as states voluntarily, by and from the Church of England, an acknowledgedly pure branch of the Church of Christ, and that it therefore follows, by necessary consequence, as the Church could not a second time be planted within it, that, under the Scriptural obligations of Christian unity, with the penalty of schism hanging over those who violate it, all Christians were and are bound, on Scriptural principles, to look unto the communion of *that* Church."—Pp. 126, 127.

These "facts of history," and the reviewer's deductions, open a wide field for remark ; but we have only space for a few brief notes.

1. The reviewer does not deign to consider the claims of any body of Christians to ecclesiastical jurisdiction in these United States, except the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholics ; they being the only legitimate branches of the Catholic Church who, according to him, have any claims to make.

2. He dates "the apostolical gift" at 1784, the period of the ordination of Bishop Seybury, who was not deemed competent to convey the succession, having been ordained by the schismatical Nonjurors of Scotland. And though, according to his own showing, the episcopal college was not full until 1790, "the apostolic gift" not being complete until the canonical number from the archbishop of Canterbury was obtained, yet he sets aside the claim of the Roman Catholics, who, it seems, had obtained from the pope "the apostolical gift" the same year, (1790.)

3. He claims for his Church the right of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over all Christians and churches of whatever name in these United States. We can scarcely meet this arrogant pretension with serious argument. And most certainly, though the Methodist Episcopal Church was duly organized under the government of



an "episcopate" as truly apostolical as any in the world before the arrival upon these shores of any bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, we make no claim on that account that "all Christians were bound, on Scriptural principles, to look unto the communion of that Church." We only claim that we have a right to preserve our own organization, and most certainly shall still continue to do so, notwithstanding, by so doing, we incur "the penalty of schism."

4. The "national existence" of the Protestant Episcopal Church, according to the doctrine of the reviewer, is the utter annihilation of the claims of all other Christian churches to the ordinances, and a right to perpetuate their own institutions. This is unblushing effrontery, too popish to require from the Protestant communions of this country more than the rebuke of silent contempt. How far this spirit of a "national" religion is to obtain in our country, time only can tell.

On the "principle" set forth by the reviewer, he thinks "all foreign missionary operations in the Church should ever be conducted." But to this he must needs have an "exception," in "form," at least, "as when a Christian Church follows abroad her own children, with her own language and liturgy, where difference of tongue demands imperatively a different administration." Under this class of justifiable exceptions, he concludes, "falls the case of an English bishop in the continent of Europe, and another in the Mediterranean," and he might have added *another* in Jerusalem. This seems plausible indeed. One branch of the Catholic Church must not trespass upon the territories occupied by another, except to follow "her own children, with her own language and liturgy." But how has it come to pass that the "English bishops" abroad give instruction and the ordinances to natives, and make converts to their own party? What has "The Church Missionary Society" been about in "the Mediterranean?" Why, greatly to the annoyance of the Puseyites, they have there acted as a "sect," and have wrested from their legitimate pastors the sheep assigned to them by the Shepherd and Bishop of souls. And as to the "new bishop of Jerusalem," we are told that "the queen's license assigns Syria, Chaldee, Egypt, and Abyssinia, as the limits within which he is to exercise jurisdiction."—*Church Record*, vol. ii, p. 30.

All this, qualified as it may be, according to the Church principles advocated by the reviewer, and Churchmen generally, is rank *schism*. What does the Church of Rome pretend to do in England and America more than to follow "her own children with her own [peculiar] language and liturgy?" And for this very thing, a parental duty which she executes, we doubt not, in as good

faith as do English missionaries abroad, English successionists have to this day charged her with "the sin of schism." We have already seen what is the sentence of the reviewer himself in this case. "Altar," says he, "cannot rise against altar without sin. Thus, in the realm of England, the Church of Rome was and is schismatic."

On this principle our reviewer insists that "the proposed action of the American Church, in the case of her Texian children," should be constructed. That is, she must follow *them* "with her own language and liturgy," but must make no converts from the native population, for they belong to the *padree*, nor even from foreigners who belong to any other branch of "the Catholic Church." Very well. All this is doubtless quite canonical. Church missionaries to Texas must not alienate any from their divinely constituted pastors. Should they induce any to join their communion, and to leave the confessional of the dancing, drunken, debauched *padree*, they would be horribly schismatical. Perhaps the wise instructions of the reviewer will all be faithfully carried out.

But let us know, good reviewer, who you reckon among the Church's "own children" "in Texas?" Doubtless *all who are not Roman Catholics!* Well, send on your missionaries, sir. But they will find the great mass of the people of the young republic as slow to acknowledge the claims of the old mother as many of her disobedient children in the United States. She followed us with "her language and liturgy;" yes, she is now pursuing us with her *Romish mummary*; but her efforts are vain. True Protestants will stand fast in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made them free, and not again be entangled in the yoke of bondage.

We must pass over several topics which would afford matter for serious reflection, and come finally to the expose which the reviewer has made of his views of Romanism. He must set down the "rapidly increasing influence among us of the Church of Rome," as among the obstacles with which the Church has to contend, and which, somehow, must be overcome. But upon the subject of a *union* of the two communions, the review is, though rather wordy, yet quite intelligible. We shall give the passage entire:—

"Under these contradictory feelings nothing is harder to the right-minded Christian than to use language toward the Church of Rome at once respectful enough for its orthodox truths, and yet condemnatory enough for its unscriptural falsehood. We can hardly speak in any terms of it without either wounding charity or wounding truth. In its apostolic ministry, in its primitive orthodoxy, in its sacraments of grace,

we reverence it as among the pillars of that temple which God, and not man, hath builded; but alas for the worm at its heart; its bigotry, its corruption, and its spirit of worldly domination. Yet even these are not the impassable gulf. Not for her corrupt doctrines or practices does she stand at such an illimitable distance from the true Catholic Christian; these might be reformed, or, even as they stand, are not necessarily repugnant to the vital graces and growth of the Christian; nor yet for her bigotry, as arising from ignorance and false zeal, for this, Christian education, and the light of God's truth, and the exercise of a more reflecting reason, might suffice to alter; nor yet again, evil and unchristian as that is, is the spirit of worldly domination the insuperable obstacle, for that, too, as it was the growth of ignorance and a dark age, so, too, under the spirit of a more enlightened one, might it stand rebuked and corrected; not for these, therefore, do we feel constrained to hold aloof from all contact with the Church of Rome, but because she has bound herself by *oath* never to cease to condemn all other claims to the Christian name, and, trampling them under foot, to hold all who yield not unlimited submission to Rome, as anathematized, and beyond the pale of salvation."—Pp. 142, 143.

A careful examination of this passage will sufficiently evince to the reader that the American reviewer is not far behind his English contemporaries in a desire for a union with the Roman Church. "Its unscriptural falsehood, bigotry, corruption, spirit of worldly domination, ignorance and false zeal," are admitted by the reviewer; but he says, "Yet even these are not the impassable gulf." "These might be reformed, or, even as they stand, are not necessarily repugnant to the vital graces and growth of the Christian." The fathers of the English Church, as the homilies abundantly show, considered the Church of Rome as entirely corrupted—rotten at the core. Hence they appropriated to that communion the appellations of "antichrist," "the man of sin," "whore of Babylon," &c. Bishop Jewell says,—"*Verily the Church of Rome, these many years, may seem to have been nothing else but a mother of falsehood, and a school of pride.*"—*Defense*, p. 532. And in later times, Bishop Taylor, himself a violent Churchman, makes a strong argument upon the following proposition, viz.: "The Church of Rome, as it is at this day disordered, teaches doctrines, and uses practices, which are, in themselves, or in their true and immediate consequences, *direct impieties*, and *give warranty* to a *wicked life*."—*Dissuasive from Popery*, chap. 2.

Little did these pious and learned bishops, and able defenders of the Church of England, imagine that Church-of-England men would ever seriously contend that the "mother of falsehood," with her sanction of "direct impieties," and her "warranty to a wicked life," is not, in her principles and practice, "necessarily repugnant



to the vital graces and growth of the Christian." But so it has turned out. What the fathers of the English Church abhorred and denounced as "impiety," has finally come to be considered by their degenerate sons as quite harmless, if not, indeed, an acceptable service to God!

The only obstacle to union, which the reviewer seems to consider as absolutely insuperable, is the "unlimited submission" which Rome requires of all who bear the Christian name. In this particular it seems that the American reviewer has not quite kept pace with his great masters over the water. The British Critic, as we have seen, considers the "union of the whole church under one visible government as abstractedly the most perfect state," and in relation to submission to Rome, he tells us that "a spiritual yoke is, of itself, no necessary evil," and that "lacking union with the see of Rome" is so far from "asserting a right," that it is actually to "forego a privilege." "Here," says the Critic, "is a view which promises us the power of upholding Pope Hildebrand\* and the see of St. Peter, for all the reformers derided the supremacy of the Church." The Critic can, of course, no longer stumble at the supremacy of the pope, whenever it shall become consistent with the circumstances of the beneficed English clergy to admit that great heresy. American Churchmen rather stick at this point, though they are, if possible, more ready than their British brethren to yield to Romanists every thing else. But they progress so rapidly in their recognitions of the *Catholic principles* which their fathers, through the influence of the wrong-headed continental reformers, had been induced to repudiate, that it is not impossible but this point too will finally be yielded to the true *visible head* of the Catholic Church.

The union of the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Roman Catholic Church in this country is beset with no *legal* difficulties. Though the former is, as the reviewer tells us, the only rightful owner of the soil, and has an "unquestioned independent national existence," yet she is not so trammelled by the state but that she can freely consult such measures as she may judge best for the restoration of "Catholic unity." She has no benefices to forfeit, by recognizing the claims of the holy father to universal supremacy, and so ridding herself of the guilt of that "sacrilege which assailed"

\* This same pope, called Gregory I., who was the first to claim both spiritual and temporal supremacy over all kings and countries, and one of the most unblushing of all that line of tyrants who have filled the chair of St. Peter; this same abandoned despiser of the rights of both God and man, the Critic dignifies with the appellation of "*holiest Gregory!*"—*July No.*, p. 142.

this prime article of the Romish faith in the days of "the so-called reformers." When this is done we shall hear no more from our Churchmen in this country of "the papal yoke," or any other "phrases of a like bold and undutiful tenor."

Of the probability of this consummation, considered by some so devoutly to be wished, we say nothing. We do, however, rejoice to know that a very spirited opposition to the doctrines of the Oxford Romanists is sustained in the Protestant Episcopal Church, and we can but hope that it will ultimately triumph.

The object fearlessly announced by the British Critic, and to accomplish which the Oxford divines are laboring most unceasingly, is "the *unprotestantizing* of the national Church." In this work the Critic seems encouraged by the prospect of ultimate success. He says, "We cannot stand where we are; we must go backward or forward; and it will surely be the latter."—*July No.*, p. 45. In the sixth article of the above number of the Critic the writer gives us a tolerably full account of his hopes and fears in relation to the *missionary* operations in the East. He will *hope*, even against hope. For though he complains most bitterly of "The Church Missionary Society," he consents to a "Mediterranean bishop," provided he shall not have "the appearance of a schismatic intruder." He gives rather a reluctant consent to this for a time, that the three great branches of the Catholic Church may be brought into a juxta-position, which may facilitate their ultimate union. The writer says,—

"The Mediterranean, then, seems to present the only scene in which the churches, either of Greece or Rome, can be approached, with a view to the renewal of natural relations with them by their Anglican sister."—*July No.*, p. 141.

The union of the Greek, Roman, and Anglican Churches, it is expected, will commence in the Mediterranean, on the little island of Malta. Our Oxford divines are hoping (and *praying* too, if they can find any such prayer in the book) that this union may soon be consummated; and then, no doubt, the glorious millennium will not tarry long. But to the serious Christian such a union would promise about as much for the universal diffusion and final triumph of Christianity as "the holy alliance," as it was called, did for the liberty of Europe. These fallen churches must all be renovated before their union will be productive of the smallest beneficial results. Indeed, it is probable that should such a connection as is now so much talked of be formed, it would be an alliance against Protestantism, and would be combining and centralizing the whole power of antichrist against the true church of

God. But there need be neither hopes nor fears of this wonderful junction of the three great branches of the Catholic Church. They are each and all too selfish and worldly in their policy, and too jealous of each other. There would, in such an event, be too many *popes*, and too much difficulty in determining upon a common centre of union. In all this we may be mistaken. The high hopes of the Tractarians may rest upon a solid basis; but if it is so, that basis is too deep for our observation.

We are, indeed, told that the principles of the Oxford divines are mightily extending in our own country. The reviewer of Palmer on the Church says,—

“One fact, at least, must stand unquestioned, and that is, that in no portion of Christendom are these principles of a true Catholic Church making a more rapid progress, or taking a higher stand than here.”—*New-York Review*, Jan. No., p. 139.

Now if the reviewer’s “principles of a true Catholic Church” were such as are held forth in the New Testament, and as were professed by the pious reformers, his announcement would be matter of joy and gratulation. But being aware that the reviewer has nothing in his mind but a visible organization holding many corrupt dogmas, were we certain that he had made a correct estimate of the state of the question in this country, it would occasion us deep and bitter regret. There is, indeed, too much reason to believe that the errors of Oxfordism in their worst form are exceedingly rife in this country. If this were not the fact we should not find such explicit avowals of the Romish heresies which have been received in the Church of England by the Oxford divines, as is very common in *The Churchman* and kindred periodicals. For the reader’s edification we will give him a few specimens of this kind from the above paper:—

“We hold tradition to be interpretive of Scripture, and that any tradition coming upon the same testimony as an apostolic epistle (*for the canon of Scripture depends upon traditive testimony*) is of equal divine sanction.—We admit that *hades* is a PURGATORY, i. e., a place of rest, where the faithful, in incipient bliss, are *cleansed* from passions and adhering carnalities, and prepared for heaven by being perfected in holiness; not denying that the eucharistic sacrifice, as also the prayers of the faithful here, profit them, they being part of the Catholic Church.—We admit the efficacy of the sacraments fully, as anciently taught.—We hold the high *sacramental character* of ORDERS and MATRIMONY.—In PENANCE there is outward sign of apostolical institution.—UNCTION we admit, upon a passage in St. James. EXORCISM we confess is catholic.—The Reformation did more injury, by far, to the church catholic, than did ever the persecutions of paganism.—The



utterly untenable Protestant ground" on "the authority of tradition.—The pernicious Protestant Solifidian doctrine" of "justification by faith.—Far from being grieved or scandalized, to hear that attempts have been made in the university of Oxford to encourage auricular confession, (*sit venia verbi!*) [i. e., the word may be admitted] we rejoice at it as the omen of a brighter day in her history."

This language is taken from the official organ of the diocese of New-York. How well it becomes a D. D., in a church purporting by her style and profession to be *Protestant*, let the intelligent reader judge for himself. And most assuredly it can be no great matter of surprise if the editor of the *Churchman* should soon follow several illustrious examples in England and America, of ministers leaving "*the Church*," and going over to "*the mother of all churches*." The sooner such men leave all connection with the Protestant churches, the more honorable to them and the safer for those churches, for it can scarcely be deemed uncharitable to say that they are a scandal to the Protestant name and cause, not to say to Christianity itself.

We shall now conclude this paper by glancing at the leading principles which have passed under review.

One of the principles we have noticed, and which constitutes a line of distinction between Catholics and Protestants, is, that *the Church is the authoritative expounder of Scripture*. Now this principle, besides being utterly without divine sanction, has the further inconvenience of being both absurd and dangerous. For touching all those questions upon which private judgment might go astray, the Church gives us no uniform decision. The Church in one age has contradicted the Church in another, and one branch of the Catholic Church has contradicted another branch of the Catholic Church of the same age, when, according to the canons laid down by our Catholics, both are of equal authority.

The reviewer of Mr. Palmer, after his author, gives us "the only test that all Christians can acknowledge, namely, the coincidence of all, or, in other words, the authority of the church catholic as it hath from time to time spoken forth its judgments," or, in the language of Vincentius, of Lirinensis: "*Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*."—*What is always, what is everywhere, and what is by all*. Now we fearlessly challenge the reviewer to bring his peculiar dogmas to the "test" of examination by this famous rule. If his doctrines of the Church, of apostolical succession, of episcopacy *jure divino*, of grace in the sacraments, &c., &c., can be proved to have this evidence of universal consent, then we will receive these doctrines as settled. Not that we

admit that this evidence, could it be produced, would be absolutely authoritative ; for we must hold that every man is responsible to God for his interpretation of Holy Scripture ; a responsibility which could have no existence if we are bound to receive the expositions of the Church as authoritative and final. But we know that this much-vaunted rule is as useless in practice as it is wrong in principle, for not one of the "*Catholic verities*," which are rejected by Protestants, can, for a moment, support a claim to the *universal consent* which is made the great, "the only test" of "fundamentals."

And supposing we were to receive all this, and consent to put ourselves under the guidance of the Protestant Episcopal Church. Here we find even the high functionaries of the Church perfectly antagonistic upon the most vital points. Who will tell us what constitutes "the visible Church?" Who will settle the intimately related question of the validity of "lay baptism?" When the editor of Palmer, the bishop of the diocese of Maryland, differs from his author, and our sage reviewer differs from both, which shall we follow? Shall we take the articles, homilies, and liturgy for the authorized exposition of the doctrine of Holy Scripture? These we learn from the Oxfordists are quite too *Protestant* in their character. And if this objection were removed, then which is the infallible interpretation of Scripture, the English or the American Prayer Book? for they differ materially, even in *matters of faith*. Shall we go to the Churchman and the New-York Review, or to the Church Record and the Recorder, to the bishop of the diocese of Ohio and of Virginia, or to the bishop of New-York and New-Jersey, to be taught the true Catholic doctrines? Where is this boasted "unity of the faith?" We profess we are utterly unable to find it, and we are as poorly qualified to see the Christian modesty of such claims to it as are made by our Churchmen. In their present distracted condition they are not *safe guides to the blind*.

Again : as to the arrogant claims set up by Churchmen, we have already intimated that they can scarcely be met either by argument or serious remonstrance. That the pastors and governors of the Protestant Episcopal Church have a legitimate right to teach and govern the people who have voluntarily committed themselves to their spiritual care, we are not at all disposed to dispute. If this were the extent of their claim, none but Romanists would for a moment call it in question. But when they claim by *divine* right, or by a universally established ecclesiastical right, to be *the only authorized interpreters of God's word*, and *the only Christian pastors in the land* ; and brand all other pastors and teachers with the odious

epithets of *schismatics* and *intruders*, we cannot tamely submit. Such arrogance is altogether intolerable, and in this age and country must bring upon its abettors disappointment, confusion, and ruin.

But, finally, as to the tendencies to the corruptions of Romanism, and the bare-faced abandonment of the fundamental principles of the great Reformation from popery, which show themselves in the Church of England and the Protestant Episcopal Church, we are surprised at the result of our investigations. There is such a flood of new light, or blue light, or something which is the opposite of all light, that our powers of vision are utterly obscured, and we are led to exclaim, Upon what sad times have we fallen !

And are our sober Churchmen prepared for all the developments of Catholic truth which are now coming forth from Oxford and New-York ? We are perfectly aware that many of them are not. We hope such may consider at this point, the propriety of reviewing their ground, and inquiring whether the results to which Oxfordism brings us do not follow legitimately from such *Church principles* as, within these few years past, have been quite generally adopted by our leading Churchmen. And now, that the line of division is between Roman and Anglican Catholicity and true Protestantism, it is a question of no ordinary interest whether they will try to stand between these two grand divisions ; and, if not, which they will select. Romanism and Protestantism are two types of Christianity, one of which each Christian communion will, of course, be expected to take. And if our Churchmen go over to Romanism, it is to be hoped they will abandon the Protestant name and profession ; in which event the Protestant cause must be sustained without their help, and the Protestant communions will be obliged by a proper regard to the pure principles of Christianity to identify them with "the man of sin," and of course to stand in relation to them in the attitude of stern and uncompromising opposition. Should they not formally recognize the doctrine of the pope's supremacy, which it is highly probable they will not do for a long time to come, yet should they follow in the wake created by the Tractarians, they will become essentially Roman in all other respects. Their sympathies will all be with Roman Catholics, and though they continue to object to some part of the policy of the holy see, they will be used most effectually by the pope's agents in opposition to our Protestant institutions. The weight of their influence will go to the support of a ghostly despotism from which our country has more to fear than from all other dangerous causes combined. In all great leading questions, both theological and political, English Catholics, that is, Oxfordists



and Romanists, agree. They have common sympathies and common interests, though they have not yet become formally united. But if a portion of the Protestant Episcopal Church should still adhere to their articles and homilies, and to the truths for which their confessors and martyrs suffered and bled, and should cherish a feeling of Christian fellowship for their Protestant brethren of other churches, those churches will be happy to hail them as brethren beloved, and to honor them as a sister church.

On the settlement of American independence, the Churchmen in this country organized and took their own course to procure what they considered a legitimate episcopacy. To this no reasonable person could object. It has, indeed, been to us a matter of no ordinary interest to trace the progress of the sect in the United States from its earliest beginnings to its final organization and establishment. None but an energetic and a liberal mind would ever have so cast off the shackles of a high-toned and an exclusive system as to propose a provisional ordination for the American branch of the English Church, as did Bishop White. And though we cannot doubt but such an ordination as he proposed would have been as Scriptural and valid as the one which was ultimately secured, we can feel nothing but gratification in view of the consummation of the wishes of Churchmen in the acquisition of what all were prepared to recognize as a truly apostolical episcopate. This was coming into their desired haven, after a laborious and dreary night of correspondences, conventional discussions, and embassies to the mother country.

The Protestant Episcopal Church now took its place among the American Churches, not claiming to be *exclusively* entitled to the exercise of ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the country, but solemnly conceding to each and every church in the United States the right to institute such form of government as to it might seem best. (See *Preface to the American Prayer Book*.) In the character of a sister church, and a member of the great Protestant family, the various Protestant communities have ever been willing to recognize her. And especially, as she assumed in her organization the distinctive appellation of Protestant, they have had grounds for the fullest confidence in her support in all great questions, either in theology or civil polity, in which they might be brought into conflict with popery. This confidence has remained firm until the recent movements at Oxford, and the responses which have been made in this country to a call from that quarter upon Churchmen everywhere to return to Catholic unity. And all eyes are now open to see which way the tide will turn.

In the mean time we have no special favors to ask at the hand of our Church friends. Though we are not in the least disposed to deny them the rights and privileges of a sect of Christians, we award them no *exclusive* claims to a ministry *divinely* constituted, or to the right use of the ordinances. We as cordially award to the churches of Puritan or Anabaptist origin the right to the ordinances, and a claim to a valid Christian ministry, as to Protestant Episcopalians.

As for our own church, we claim for her a legitimate episcopacy. The fact that we *are* an episcopal church cannot be questioned. The only question which can be raised is as to the *origin* of our episcopacy. Whether a body of presbyters can consistently with God's word constitute a bishop. This question does not involve the question of the right of waiving conventional canons, or of separation. This right has been conceded by many Episcopalians. Indeed, the Church of England assumed that right in her original organization, and has always acted upon it in her disobedience to Rome. The simple question then is, whether a number of presbyters have a right to organize and institute such a form of government as they may judge most agreeable to God's word for the benefit of such as God has committed to their charge; and if they judge it most agreeable to the Scriptures, to invest one, or more, with the powers of a general oversight or jurisdiction, and to set him or them apart to this holy service by the imposition of their hands and prayer, the person so constituted and consecrated is a primitive and Scriptural bishop. Upon this question we are always ready to meet our Church exclusionists in free and fair discussion. Nor have we ever declined answering to the charge of *unjustifiable schism*. We will tell them, in all simplicity and plainness, why we cannot give up our own institutions and adopt theirs.

But we humbly submit it whether there is not a full opportunity for all the different Christian communities to lay out their energies in aggressions upon the territories of the common enemy, without infringing upon each other? We know our Churchmen will meet us here with the plea, that *God has committed the authority to ordain ministers and to govern the Church to a personal succession of bishops*, and this being the case, none can act under a divine commission, not ordained by them and under their jurisdiction. Now heré we are at issue. We deny both the theory and the fact of such a succession. If, indeed, they only have the true apostolic commission, then we can make no claim to a right to occupy a foot of ground anywhere, however waste and desolate it may be. If these high claims can be established by the word of God, why,

then, we must yield to the divine arrangements, and give up our organization, our ministry, and our churches, and leave Churchmen in possession of the right God has given them to reform the world.

But if the Methodist Church is to be disbanded, we know not what will become of us. If you say, Come and join "the Church," we answer, that we have serious doubts whether we should serve your purpose. The apparatus of the Church is too cumbrous, and there is not found in her institutions and her spirit, sufficiently developed, the true characteristics of the apostolic church to harmonize with the spirit of Methodism. The present state of the *sects*, which call themselves "*the Church*," would make us hesitate as to the propriety of union with them if we had previously been free from doubts. One attribute of the Church, according to all the Roman and Anglican Catholic writers, is *unity*. But if their definitions of unity are to be relied upon, it long since fled from the Church. They have not preserved a shadow of it among themselves, and yet they ever and anon charge "the sects" with a grievous violation of this principle. The three great divisions of the Catholic Church, according to Churchmen, are the Roman, the Greek, and the Anglican Churches. The Roman and Greek Churches have been in a state of schism for about a thousand years, and the Roman and Anglican for three hundred. They are divided upon radical points of Christian doctrine and ecclesiastical polity, and mutually anathematize each other. Now, if these three communions are still legitimate branches of the Catholic Church, then one of the essential properties of the visible church—her unity—is annihilated, or unity is consistent with voluntary schism and the most deadly hostility. But if true catholicity is retained by one of the branches only, then the others are not branches of the Catholic Church at all, but are wanton schismatics and heretics.

Now, under these circumstances, would we restore the unity of the Catholic Church; how could we do it? Should we effect that object by uniting with (rather suffering ourselves to be *absorbed* or *devoured* by) one of the schismatical branches? Surely this would not be the proper course. The fact is, the unity of the visible church, according to the Roman and Anglican Church view, is a phantom. There is no such thing in being. They themselves had annihilated it long before "the fanatical and schismatical Wesley" was born. With what face then do they now demand that *we* restore what *they* have demolished? We must beg them to excuse us from any attempt to remedy their errors. But we cannot enlarge. Our page is full, and we must close.

ART. VIII.—*Butler's Analogy*.—*Introductory Essay* by Barnes.

[WE confess we have long been mortified at the fact that the edition of the *Analogy* in most extensive circulation in this country should be that which is accompanied by the *Introductory Essay* by the Rev. Albert Barnes. Not to insist that the great work of Butler needs no such appendage as would result from the best effort which such a writer as Mr. Barnes could put forth, it is quite sufficient to say, that while he attempts to help himself by a misapplication of the principles of his author, he unsettles and lays open to doubt the whole fabric which had been constructed at such a vast expense of intellectual toil. A philosophic skeptic would be likely to be silenced by the irresistible reasoning of Bishop Butler, as it was left by him, and as it ought for ever to remain. But after reading the "Essay," he would most probably conclude, that there must be some latent fallacy in an argument which is capable of the use made of it by the writer.

But we protest against an application of the facts and reasoning of the *Analogy*, not only at war with the theological views of the author, but not authorized by the slightest analogy between the fundamental principles which he employed them to settle and the hypotheses of the essayist. Mr. Barnes may go ahead, if he is permitted to couple to the bishop's car. But, for ourselves, we should choose to let him generate steam for himself, and operate upon his own resources.

The doctrines of the Calvinistic creed have usually been held by their abettors as peculiarly matters of revelation, and not capable of proof from *the analogies of nature*. If it is indeed so, we are doubtless bound to receive them *as matters of revelation*, though they might lie involved in so much apparent inconsistency as to be incapable of rational solution. But Mr. Barnes' attempt at confirming and illustrating the distinguishing features of Calvinism by the analogical argument of Bishop Butler, is not only a novel course, but a singular failure, there being no sort of analogy between the partial system of the great Geneva reformer and the course of nature. Upon the whole, we cannot suppress the expression of a hope that an American edition of Butler's *Analogy* may, ere long, be put into circulation without the *Introductory Essay*.—ED.]

As public attention has, in some measure, been directed to "the *Analogy*" by the able review of it in the *Quarterly*, it may not be amiss to call some attention also to the "*Introductory Essay*," with which it has been "unequally yoked."



The Analogy, itself, needs no encomium from us. It has already survived the rough winds and changing vicissitudes of a century; and still stands with laurels fresh and green as in the age whose peculiar emergencies called it forth; and whose infidelity, thoughtlessness, and vice, it was designed to check. Though, in style and dress, it bears the impress of a former age, yet there is a lofty grandeur in the thoughts, blended with a conclusiveness in the arguments, which is without a rival in any subsequent production. The highest encomium that need be passed upon it is, that the stupendous object of its author was fully accomplished. The headlong propensities of the age were checked; and infidelity received a discomfiture from which it has not been able to recover. Its impudent boasts that revealed religion is contradictory to the course of nature, withered under the rigid demonstrations of "the Analogy of Religion, natural and revealed, to the constitution and course of nature." The citadel of truth was here surrounded by arguments, based upon the analogies of things observed and experienced in the ordinary course of nature, and addressed to the common sense of mankind. The work is a monument of intellectual power. Infidels have cowered before it; and by their silence endeavored to conceal their defeat, while they sought out new modes of attack. Such was the Analogy; such the object of its author; "single handed and alone," he entered the field of conflict; but retired from it the successful champion of truth.

But still, according to the "Introductory Essay,"—"there is an important part of the subject untouched." This deficiency, occurring, as it does, in "the most interesting and important part" of the subject, the Essay proposes to remedy. Does the reader ask, in amazement, "what this great deficiency can be?" To follow the language of the author of the Essay as closely as we can, it is that Butler has not carried out "the analogy of the Christian scheme, as we understand it, to the course of nature." He has not even mentioned "the fact that all the objections urged against Calvinism lie against the actual order of events." To make up this deficiency he would "inquire whether Butler has not furnished us materials to annihilate every objection against what are called doctrines of grace." Here, then, lame and halting Calvinism is to be propped up with splinters, filched away from one who had no fellowship with it. If Butler has undesignedly left *materials* for the *annihilation* of all objections to Calvinism, we cannot but infer that they have been *unskillfully* used.

But how happens it that so profound a thinker as Butler should have omitted that which is, "in some respects, the most interesting

and important part" of the subject, viz., the analogy of Calvinism "to the constitution and course of nature?" The author of the "Essay" says,—“Had his object been to carry it to its utmost extent, there were two important causes which would have arrested his progress where it actually has stopped.” The first cause assigned is, that he had not “himself fully embraced the evangelical system.” A very good reason, certainly. “The other cause of the deficiency is, it was not possible for Butler, with the statements then made of the doctrines of grace, to carry out his argument, and give it its true bearings on these doctrines.” But what were these “statements” of the “evangelical system,” that rendered it so anomalous in the government of God? or that caused the benevolent mind of Butler to recoil with horror, and filled it with disgust? Why,—nothing more nor less than an honest exhibition of the “rough-cast system” of Calvinism. Those were days when Calvinism, “rough shod, trode the land.” The “statements” of the doctrine had not then been refined, polished, *transcendentalized*. Men had not learned to whiffle and prevaricate in their “statements” of this notable doctrine. Those were days, “when they told of imputing the sin of one man to another, and holding that other personally answerable for it;” “when they affirmed, that men have no power to do the will of God, and yet will be damned for not doing it;” “when they told of a limited atonement, of confining the original applicability of the blood of Christ to the elect alone.” Such were the “statements” of the “doctrines of grace” in Butler’s day. We will not now stop to inquire whether the “doctrines” have been changed or merely the “statements” of them. But it seems to be the opinion of the essayist, that had Butler but seen Calvinism in its new dress,—had he seen the “rough-cast” ghost of unconditional election and reprobation, refined by the latest method of “stating” the doctrine,—his Analogy would not now be found limping, “deficient” in “the most interesting and important part.”

The object of the “Introductory Essay” is not to apply “the language of severe criticism to the Analogy,” nor to “question the piety” of its author; but merely to supply the “deficiency.” In passing to consider how the essayist has accomplished his work, we cannot help remarking that the statement that the objections to “the doctrines of grace” “have seldom, if ever, been drawn from the Bible,” is widely different from the facts in the case. The Bible has ever been the foundation, the very corner-stone of these objections; and the doctrine is as clearly contradictory to the teachings of holy writ as it is to the “constitution and course of nature.”

One of the new "statements" of Calvinism is, that it is not to be held responsible for the *fall*; but to be considered only in its relation to the *recovery* of man. It is merely a remedial system, "proposed to *remedy an existing state of evil*." But was not this "existing state of evil" a part of that universal decree which "fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass?" Did not that decree embrace the fall of man? Did it not embrace every act, every sin of every individual? Why not, then, hold this scheme "responsible for the *fall*, as well as for the *recovery*, of man?" According to this "evangelical scheme," God determines that man shall sin; but, at the same time, holds him responsible for that sin. The peculiar analogy of this doctrine "to the constitution and course of nature," the essayist has, for good reasons, thought best "*to let alone*."

But let us consider the "evangelical scheme" in its *remedial* point of view, and endeavor to trace out its analogies. It here embraces two "apparently contradictory" propositions: "The first is, that the atonement was originally applicable to all men." That *this* feature of the "evangelical scheme" finds analogies in nature, we readily admit. The universal diffusion of the richest gifts in nature affords abundant evidence of the impartial goodness of God. "He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good, and sendeth rain on the just and on the unjust." The all-surrounding, all-vivifying air we breathe, the very showers and dews that water and refresh the earth; nay, every gift in the providence of God is, in its nature, applicable to all.

"The second [proposition] is, that it [the atonement] is actually applied to only a portion of the race, and that it was the purpose of God that it should be so applied." The simple statement set forth in this proposition, is, that God has made sufficient atonement for all our race; but, at the same time, has determined that only a portion of it shall partake of the benefit of that atonement. To show the analogy of such an operation as this to the constitution and course of nature, we must find that God provides natural blessings of universal applicability; but permits their application,—nay, absolutely decrees their application,—to only a portion of the beings to whom they are applicable. The fact that there are blessings of universal applicability, which are not applied to all, we admit; but that they are not so applied because God has determined "that they should be *actually* applied to but part," we deny, and heartily deprecate the consequences of a doctrine so monstrous in absurdity. This, however, the author of the "Essay" takes for granted, and thus very ingeniously evades the gist of the whole inquiry, by begging the question. With him, the statements that



a fact exists, and that God decreed it, are identical ; and he seems to think that the very circumstance of a fact existing is full proof that God decreed it. Admit these premises, and we will at once agree with the author that if the doctrine we are combating was "not found in the Scriptures, the scheme would be taken out from the analogy of the world." For when we have once admitted, for instance, that the Hindoo, who suffers and dies under the rage of a burning fever, suffers and dies because God has decreed that the healing properties of the quinine "shall not be applied to him ;" then may we also conclude, reasoning from analogy, that the sinner who dies in his sins, or dies because God has decreed that that atonement which had an "original applicability to all," should not be applied to him. How absurd such a conclusion ! How can a thing be "applicable to all men," when "it is the purpose—the decree of God that it should be actually applied to but a part ?" The propositions are not merely "apparently contradictory," but *really and essentially so*. For if God decreed that the atonement should be applied to but part of the human race, then that very decree rendered it inapplicable to the rest.

But let us follow the essayist a little further. If one interpose the question, Why God made this *universal* atonement, if he determined for it a partial application ? we should be met with the reply, that, "We see in this the hand of the same God that pours the rays of noon-day on barren sands, and genial showers on desert rocks, where no man is." A close inspection will show us that the "analogy" here is more specious than real. In the first place, "the rays of noon-day," and the "genial showers" fall in obedience to a universal law whose existence the determinate facts of science have demonstrated ; but, on the other hand, the existence of a decree limiting the applicability of the atonement which is, at the same time, "applicable to all men," has not been satisfactorily proved. Again, is it *really in vain*, that the "rays of noon-day fall upon barren sands, and genial showers on desert rocks ?" God careth for the beasts that roam over the barren wastes, and for the eagle that fixes its ærie upon the desert rock. But who shall say that amidst the changes and vicissitudes of society, the improvements that are progressing in commerce, agriculture, and the arts, these barren wastes may not be fertilized and become the abodes of civilized life—the theatres of thrilling and momentous events ? Who shall say that the hitherto unbroken solitude of the desert rocks may not be broken by the din and bustle of another Petra nestled in their fastnesses ? But what shall we say of the *provision* made for the salvation of those to



whom the eternal decree of God forbids its application? What *can* we say of it? or how can we account it other than (we speak with reverence) a God-dishonoring failure? But when we consider that provision is made for the salvation of all, and no bar is interposed by God to its accomplishment; then we discover at once its analogy to the "constitution and course of nature," by which the necessary blessings of life are provided, and nothing but the vices and follies of man can prevent their being enjoyed by all our race.

Let us follow the analogies of the system a little further. "We interpret the decrees of God, so far as we can do it, *by facts*; and we say that the actual *result*, by whatever means brought about, is the expression of the *design* of God." So, then, the *fall* of man, brought about by the agency of fallen spirits, "is the expression of the design of God;" nay, the very wo and wretchedness of our race, brought about by the vices and follies of man, are only so many expressions of the same design. And yet, forsooth, we are very inconsistent to hold the "evangelical scheme" "responsible for the *fall*, as well as the *recovery*, of man." By what analogy in nature is such a system to be maintained? Here are the analogous facts: "Food is not given to all; health is not the inheritance of all; liberty, peace, and wealth, are diffused unequally among men." That these are facts, we readily admit; but whence come they? *Come they not even of the lusts*, the vices, and follies of men, rather than by "the design of God?" Who shall say that destitution, disease, and servitude are mere manifestations "of the purpose or decree of God," rather than the necessary concomitants of that "existing state of evil" which man has brought upon himself? But the existence of this decree, binding these evils upon our race, must be proved—must be demonstrated, before we can find any parallelism between them and the purposed or decreed partial application of a universal atonement. If *God* meeteth out liberty to one and servitude to another, then let not the victim of oppression complain of the oppressor in his nightly orisons, but thank God for the manacles that fetter his rust-eaten sinews. Do peace and war come and go absolutely at the bidding of God? and are they only "expressions of his design?" Is the fact, that one man pines away in sickness and poverty, while another rejoices in health and riots in luxury, to be considered as a mere manifestation of "the purpose of God?" And this, too, under the new "*statements*" of Calvinism? Then let us go back to "the rough-cast system," to the earlier and more honest "*statements*" of the doctrine.

We will tax the patience of the reader with the consideration of but one more of the positions of the essayist: "Is it owing to any

act of man that the bark of Peru was so long unknown, or that the silver of Potosi slept for ages unseen by any human eye? Is there not evidence that it was the good pleasure of the Giver that the favor should not be bestowed on men till Columbus crossed the main?" &c. We reply, these blessings, for aught we know, might have been discovered and enjoyed long before, had it not been for the moral degradation and barbarism of that portion of our race. At any rate, these treasures were there, they existed, and were applicable to the use of men; nor have we any evidence of any decree that rendered them inapplicable up to the time of their discovery. If it be urged that the atonement was made, and made for all; still I reply, the purpose of God, according to the system we are combating, rendered it absolutely inapplicable, a mere nullity, so far as it concerns a portion of our race. For that unhappy portion of our race, the atonement is a solemn mockery; the perishing are told that there is a healing balm, but not to be applied to them; the famishing are told that there is a rich "banquet of immortal food" provided for them, but a decree that they shall not be admitted to it; those groaning under the bondage of moral darkness and death are told that there is a city whose streets for ever glitter in the sun-beam of God's countenance, and where the tree of life for ever yields its healing fruit, and that for their admission the ample price is already paid, but, alas! the "decree" has gone forth, and to them its pearly gates shall never open.

Such is a brief outline of this futile effort to find analogies in nature for a doctrine so obviously absurd. The effort was indeed plied with ingenuity and commanding ability; but what architectural skill can rear the stately dome, or form the beautiful temple out of inapt and disjointed materials? The effort is in perfect keeping with many others of a sect that is not satisfied with titling its peculiar and sectarian organizations, "American,"—"National," &c., but that seems to consider itself an exclusive proprietor of every standard evangelical work that can be made to give countenance to its peculiarities, whether the author designed it or not. Butler has reared a pillar of truth of no common magnitude and durability; but the man who essays to shove it under the crumbling and tottering fabric of Calvinism has no ordinary task to perform. We protest against this and all other attempts to amalgamate error; peculiar, partial, and sectarian views, with a work so evangelical in its general character—a work altogether too elevated to be made, by any possible contortion, to stoop down to any exclusive sectarianism.

*Amenia Seminary, Jan., 1842.*

VOL. II.—20

## ART. IX.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

1. *A Discourse on the Administration of Discipline.* By ELIJAH HEDDING, D. D., Bishop of the M. E. Church. 24mo., pp. 91. New-York: G. Lane & P. P. Sandford. 1842.

THIS manual, small as it is in its dimensions, is a work of very great interest to the church. "The administration of discipline" is one of the most delicate and difficult duties which devolves upon the pastor of the flock of Christ. Embarrassments often arise from the want of specific rules in the New Testament to meet particular cases, and the difficulty with which such cases are reduced to a class, which would naturally come under some established general principle. And hence the great diversity in the administration of church discipline in the best-regulated churches.

Uniformity in all essential points in the administration of the rules of the church is vastly important to the unity and harmony of the body. And there is no doubt but we, as a church, come as near to this as could be reasonably expected. There are not many points of importance upon which the different administrators of the discipline have *settled* upon divergent courses.

There are, however, many points of great importance which are so far from being explicitly settled in our generally excellent book of Discipline, that especially young and inexperienced administrators are liable to take different views, and to pursue a different course of action. From such causes, beyond a doubt, much injury has befallen the church. In our church the subordinate is so immediately under the eye of his superior, that some degree of caution in proceeding in difficult cases, and a timely reference to constitutional instructions and advisement, will generally prevent fatal mistakes.

But all are not equally cautious in their movements. Some construe the language according to what they conceive its legitimate meaning, without any reference to usage or to the harmony of the whole system; while others study the philosophy of the rule, examine its connections and relations as a member of a complete system. These two processes often conduct men to quite different results; and hence arise injurious and mortifying discrepancies in the administration of the laws of the church. These discrepancies, if not remedied, will generate factions and feuds, and the peace and harmony of the church must give place to strife and discord.

The bishop's Discourse is designed to settle many queries which have arisen in relation to the manner in which some of the rules of the Discipline are to be applied. This is done in a manner as plain, as

natural, and as satisfactory as could be expected. The great experience of the author, in matters of discipline, has furnished him with a variety of facts. He has seen all the difficulties arising from the practical operations of the whole system of Methodism, and of all its various parts. He has been called upon to settle, both in private and in the chair, the thousand and one queries which may be raised upon some obtruse and doubtful points. In addition to his great experience, the venerable bishop has a mind peculiarly adapted to such an analysis and exposition of the Discipline as would be a safe and necessary guide to the inexperienced administrator, and would settle points which sometimes perplex even the wisest heads.

The work is executed with the bishop's characteristic precision and logical skill. The style is simple, perspicuous, natural, and forcible. The expositions are somewhat like axioms, or first principles, in reasoning, self-evident—carrying with them their own evidence. Where reasons are judged necessary, they are given in few words, to be sure, but they are never inconclusive and unsatisfactory.

No preacher, old or young, will be likely to neglect this little book ; and most who have any thing to do with the administration of the discipline of the church will make it a pocket companion, certainly, until its contents are stored up in the recesses of the mind.

But the work under consideration is not only a directory to the ministry, it is such an analysis of the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church as should be examined by all, both of the friends and foes to our economy, who may desire to find within a small compass the philosophy of our system truly delineated. And who can read what is here so graphically presented upon the subject of the duties and responsibilities of a bishop, without being deeply affected ? Our truly apostolic bishops are the direct antipodes of those who in some portions of Christendom bear the title. Their honors are the censures of the indolent, the ambitious, and the worldly ; their emoluments, weariness, painfulness, perils, and poverty ; and their relaxation, ceaseless journeyings from conference to conference, far from kindred and earthly home. Their ears must ever be open to the petitions, remonstrances, and complaints of the preachers and their families, and the church at large. The burden of the whole church is upon them.

And yet we sometimes hear of their pride of power, and of their want of sympathy with their sons in the gospel, and their wives and children, in their privations and afflictions ! If, indeed, our bishops lived at their ease—laid burdens upon us that they refused to touch with the tip of their fingers ; if they rolled in wealth and splendor while the preachers were required to sacrifice all their worldly prospects and comforts, there would be some ground for complaint. But



considering that the inequality of our system is all against them, surely complaint on our part is entirely out of place. We travel little, they much—we are from our families days, they months; we have the care of a circuit, a station, or a district, they have the care of the whole continent.

We have long been fully convinced that the difficulties in which our bishops are involved in making out the appointments, are not fully appreciated by the people. They petition for a particular man, and can see no earthly reason why *their man* should be given to others but upon the principle of *sheer partiality*. The fact is, they see but one side of the question, and frequently they take but a partial survey even of so much as this. They are looking out for themselves, and often, as the bishop suggests, make a poor selection, not knowing the men. The superintendent looks out for the interests of the whole field, and is sacredly bound not to favor one portion of that field at the expense of another.

Under these circumstances the bishop may often seem to the people to decide without good reason; for he may be in possession of facts which delicacy requires should not be made public. All these matters are set forth in so clear a light in the Discourse that we can but hope it will have the desired effect upon our leading laymen. We would most respectfully suggest to this important class, that soon after the conference opens, they carefully read over Bishop Hedding's "Discourse on the Administration of Discipline." If the official board, when they meet to take into consideration the subject of supplying their place, would first have this tender, cogent, matter-of-fact discourse read publicly as an introduction to the business, it would prepare them well for the right kind of action in the premises. For ourselves, we most cordially thank the bishop for this Discourse. And as it is printed in a volume of the size of the small edition of the Discipline, we presume that all who wish the bishop's exposition at hand, when they want light upon the rules or forms of proceeding, can be accommodated with the two bound together.

- 
2. *Sermons on Various Subjects.* By Rev. THOMAS A. MORRIS, one of the Bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. 12mo., pp. 355. Cincinnati: J. F. Wright & L. Swormstedt. 1841.

It is no easy matter to give sufficient interest to a volume of *sermons* to procure an extensive reading. This species of composition is too didactic and dry to meet the taste of the present age. But

this is not a valid reason why a choice collection of instructive sermons should not occasionally emanate from the press. Indeed, the taste of our people must be corrected in this respect. They should not be satisfied with mere fugitive matter. Their appetites should be formed for substantial nourishment, the great truths of religion set forth in a plain, neat style, and urged with divine authority.

The volume, whose title-page we have placed at the head of this notice, is just what any one, acquainted with the author, would expect from him:—a volume of *good sermons*, full of the *marrow and the fatness of the gospel*. The great doctrines and duties of Christianity are here presented in their true character, unsophisticated and unadorned. Such discourses will feed the hungry soul, and give strength and comfort to the feeble and the afflicted.

The author does not hide his sense under a multitude of words without meaning. He leaves no one, not even a child, in doubt as to what he intends to communicate. His expositions of Scripture are usually sustained by a comparison of parallel passages, and a course of argument which commends itself both to the understanding and to the better feelings of the heart.

We are happy to be able to present to the notice of our readers this book from one of our bishops: and have no doubt but the church will consider that the author has brought her under a new debt of gratitude for this effort to sustain her doctrines and institutions, and to improve her character.

The following is taken from the preface, and will afford the reader a correct idea of the plan of the discourses, and we hope beget in him a desire to read them:—

“In the selection of subjects, while variety has not been neglected, as the work will show, usefulness has been the prominent object at which I aimed. As far as any distinguishing doctrinal views appear in these discourses, they will be found to accord, substantially, with the standard works of our church; though but little reference is made to any book except the Bible, and from that quotations are numerous, and, I trust, appropriate. The plan of the Sermons is quite plain; in most cases only the general divisions are announced, and the formality of numbering the subdivisions, by prefixing figures, is generally dispensed with. In regard to style, I have endeavored in writing, as in preaching, to observe plainness of speech, omitting as far as practicable all difficult and unusual words, and adhering as nearly as convenient to Scripture phraseology. How far I have succeeded, or failed, in accomplishing these objects, let those determine who feel sufficient interest to examine for themselves. The publication of the work is an experiment; and its success will depend on the blessing of God, to whose care and favor it is now commended, in the name of Jesus. May he make these Sermons the means of instruction and

consolation to thousands of souls, after the author of them shall have gone 'the way of all the earth!'"

We will just add, that the mechanical execution of the work is such as would be creditable to any publishing house in this country.

- 
3. *The Golden Grove*.—A choice Manual, containing what is to be believed, practiced, and desired, or prayed for; the Prayers being fitted to the several Days of the Week. To which is added, a Guide for the Penitent, or, a Model drawn up for the Help of devout Souls wounded with Sin: also, Festival Hymns, according to the Manner of the ancient Church; composed for the Use of the Devout, especially of younger Persons. By JEREMY TAYLOR, D. D., Lord Bishop of Down and Connor. 18mo., pp. 155. New-York: D. Appleton & Co. 1842.

THE author of this little work was a most excellent devotional writer. His Holy Living and Dying have been productive of an incalculable amount of good. By means of these books, in connection with others of a similar character, the Wesleys were first aroused from their spiritual sloth. "The Golden Grove" is adorned with flowers of the finest tints.

The contents are, "A Short Catechism, embracing the principles of religion;" "An Exposition of the Apostles' Creed;" "Things to be done,—a rule to spend each day religiously;" "A short Method of Peace and Holiness, with a Manual of Daily Prayers;" "Things to be prayed for,—a paraphrase, expounding the Lord's prayer;" and prayers for various occasions; "A Guide for the Penitents;" and several "Festival Hymns." From the "Method of Peace and Holiness" we have selected the following instructive passages for the reader's edification, and as specimens of the work:—

"What availeth knowledge without the fear of God? An humble ignorant man is better than a proud scholar, who studies natural things, and knows not himself. The more thou knowest, the more grievously thou shalt be judged. Many get no profit by their labor, because they contend for knowledge rather than for a holy life; and the time shall come, when it shall more avail thee to have subdued *one lust*, than to have known *all mysteries*."

"Patiently suffer that from others which thou canst not mend in them, until God please to do it for thee: and remember that thou mend thyself, since thou art so willing others should not offend in any thing."

"Know that if any trouble happen to thee, it is what thou hast deserved, and therefore brought upon thyself; but if any comfort come to thee, it is a gift of God, and what thou didst not deserve. And, remember, that oftentimes when thy body complains of trouble, it is not so much the greatness of trouble, as littleness of thy spirit, that makes thee to complain."—Pp. 43, 46, 47, 48.

We cannot, however, withhold from the reader the fact that there are occasional blemishes in this generally excellent little book. The address "to the pious and devout reader" savors of the spirit of the stormy times in which the writer lived, and there are scattered through the work occasional *churchisms*, if we may coin a word, which will not enhance its value in the views of our Methodist readers.

---

4. *Treatises upon the Life, Walk, and Triumph of Faith.* By the Rev. W. ROMAINE, A. M. 12mo., pp. 392. New-York: Robert Carter. 1842.

THE author of this work was an *evangelical Churchman*, and a contemporary with the Wesleys. Like the divines of his class, his theology took its hue from the original Calvinian doctrine of "imputed righteousness." Of course a book upon "faith" from such an author would be expected to make war against the "legal spirit," and, in its prosecution, logically, though not professedly, supersede "works of righteousness," and "works meet for repentance."

The reader will see the author's meridian in the following extracts:—

"Although the believer has an old man, corrupt according to the deceitful lusts, always warring against the new man, the Lord God has promised a free and a full pardon; because he has imputed sin, all thy sin, to the Son of his love, who bore it in his own body upon the tree."

"He finds that he is still a man in Adam—still he carries about him a sinful nature, an old man as well as a new, a body of sin with all its members; he has spirit, but he has also flesh, and that which is born of the flesh is flesh, nothing but corruption, as that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. The old man has flesh still, with all its appetites and lusts: the new man is by the Spirit of life, that is in Christ Jesus, alive to God. In the same person sin dwelleth, as we read, 'When we were in the flesh, the motions of sin, which were by the law, did work in our members to bring forth fruit unto death. And the new man liveth, who, after God, is created in righteousness and true holiness.' The apostle, in Romans, chap. vii, not only confesses that he had nature and grace in him at the same time, but also describes it at full length. Indwelling sin was his continual grief, and his heavy burden: an apostle in Christ, and yet he felt the plague of his own heart: and it was his daily cross, which he was forced to bear—and his constant enemy, against which he was always at war—no peace, no truce could be made."

"O what humbling lessons does he [the believer] learn in all his approaches to God: he knows his privileges, and he wishes to live up to them, but he cannot. When he would draw near to God in the prayer of faith, the spirit is willing, but the flesh is weak. On his bended knees desiring to confess his sins, and to humble himself under



the mighty hand of God, imploring pardon through the redemption that is in the blood of the Lamb, and expecting it freely, as the most sovereign mercy that a poor sinner can receive—alas, alas! even then shame and confusion cover his face. He desires to keep his thoughts from wandering, he would have his whole heart engaged in the duty, but he cannot.”—Pp. 38, 375, 376.

The two latter passages are found under the head of “the triumph of faith.” If, in these passages, we have an exhibition of “the triumph of faith,” we scarcely know what would be the *triumph of unbelief*.

But, after all, Romaine was unaffectedly pious, not, at least in practice, suffering his *Antinomian* theory to authorize an irregular life. It is happy for the church and the world that mistaken men do not always carry out into practice what they receive in theory. Their lives are much better than their creeds. Another relief often experienced in these cases, is, that much good is mingled with what is bad, and goes, in some measure, to neutralize it. So in the work now upon our table, there is encouragement, instruction, admonition, and warning, which will ordinarily make a stronger impression than the *Solifidian* notions which are but too common. In this we do not say these erroneous views are harmless. God forbid. We have not the least fellowship for them. We would warn the unwary against them. But, withal, we are happy to find much that has a tendency to neutralize their evil effects upon the human heart. And we hope the reader of *Romaine on faith* will have the wisdom to “gather out the good, and cast the bad away.”

- 
5. *Live while you Live*. By the Rev. THOMAS GRIFFITH, A. M., Minister of Ram's Episcopal Chapel, Homerton. 18mo., pp. 168. New-York: Robert Carter. 1842.

How to *live right* while we live in the world is the great question to be studied and properly settled. How few estimate life at all! The mass of men, and it is to be feared many professing Christians, are prodigal of their precious time. Instead of living *while they live*, they live in *anticipation*: they never get ready to commence living until death comes and takes them away, and then, alas! *it is too late*.

The work upon our table is a systematic and well-digested discourse upon life: considering life, 1. As a pilgrimage; 2. A race; 3. A conflict; 4. A blessing; and, 5. A seed-time for eternity.

The author breathes a spiritual atmosphere. His appeals are earnest and impressive, and can but awaken the attention and stir the feelings of the reader who is at all susceptible of impressions from the assaults of truth. In an age of worldly excitement and unholy agita-

tion, such efforts are peculiarly appropriate. The press must, by the help and blessing of God, repair the injuries it has inflicted upon the moral sentiments of the age, or moral desolation will sweep over the nations like an overwhelming deluge. And, thank God, there are wise heads and warm hearts, in vast numbers, at work with this potent lever, trying to dispel the gloomy forebodings of the church, and bring on a more healthful condition of the public mind. We hail all these efforts, from whatever quarter they come, with joy and gratitude. We wish them God-speed. We will, in our humble way, try to co-operate with all who are engaged in this work of faith and labor of love.

---

6. *Decapolis; or, the individual Obligation of Christians to save Souls from Death: an Essay.* By DAVID EVERARD FORD. 18mo., pp. 120. New-York: Robert Carter. 1841.

THIS is a spirited and pungent appeal to slumbering Christians on behalf of the perishing multitudes around us. At the rate at which the Christian church is moving on, it would, on grounds of human probability, appear doubtful whether the gospel will ever finally triumph over the world. While so many heathen nations are without the light of the gospel, and such multitudes of the rising generation are coming up without the forming hand of religious instruction, how can those who believe in the cardinal doctrine of *eternal retribution* be contented to sit down in spiritual sloth? Will Christians let the world go to the devil without interposing a tear, a prayer, or a sigh! What an enlarged benevolence! what a spirit of holy enterprise! what self-sacrifice! what labors are called for by the emergencies of the times!

"Decapolis" is designed to produce effect;—to awaken the Christian to a sense of his high responsibilities, and to call forth the efforts of the church to stop the downward course of the world. The author's arguments are drawn from the future world—from heaven, and from hell. He writes as though he considered these things something more than mere fictions. There is a pathos and a power in his appeals, which can scarcely fail to produce the desired results. We earnestly recommend this little volume to the attention of the serious reader, and, with all sincerity, thank the publisher for giving it to the American public. We should rejoice to see this timely and impressive Essay, with the discourse recommended in the preceding notice, in the hands of parents and children. Suited as they are to make timely and early impressions, we would that they might precede, or rather supersede the *small trash* which is at present in such high request.

7. *The Natural History of Selborne.* By the Rev. GILBERT WHITE, A. M., Fellow of Oriel College, Oxford. 18mo., pp. 335. Harper & Brothers. Vol. 147 of the Family Library.

THIS charming work may be considered a classic in natural history, and should be familiar to every lover of nature. The style is simple and elegant, and the character and habits of the various animals observed by the author are described in a most entertaining and striking manner. The effect of the book must be to inspire the reader with higher sentiments of the goodness of God, and with kindlier feelings toward his creatures. There are numerous engravings of birds, &c.

---

8. *Beauties, Harmonies, and Sublimities of Nature.* With Notes, Commentaries, and Illustrations. By CHARLES BUCKE, author of "Ruined Cities," &c. 18mo., pp. 329. Harper & Brothers. Vol. 145 of the Family Library.

WE might apply the same general remark to this work that we have to the one last noticed—that it is calculated to elevate our thoughts of God by the contemplation of his works. It is, perhaps, somewhat too disconnected and discursive in its character, but abounds in beautiful thoughts, and striking and curious facts. The author is evidently an enthusiastic admirer of nature; but he does not forget through nature to look up to "nature's God." In the last article he reasons admirably against atheistical objections to a future state.

---

9. *Lives of the Ancient Philosophers.* Translated from the French of FENELON, with Notes, and a Life of the Author. By the Rev. JOHN CORMACK. 18mo., pp. 299. Harper & Brothers.

THERE is in the history, character, and sentiments of the ancient Greek philosophers much that is worthy of being studied. We may see in them how dark and uncertain is the highest human wisdom, without the guiding light of revelation. The wisest and most virtuous of the heathen fell far below the Christian standard. The Christian, therefore, may be profited by reading this volume. It is unnecessary that we should say any thing of its literary merits, as it is from the pen of the celebrated archbishop of Cambray, and the translation appears to be a good one. The work is No. 140 of the Family Library.

10. *Essays on Property and Labor, as connected with Natural Law and the Constitution of Society.* By FRANCIS LIEBER. 18mo., pp. 225. Harper & Brothers.

WE notice this work because it has a very important moral bearing. Whatever is calculated to set us right in regard to first principles, or, in other words, the equitable rules established by God for the government of his moral creatures, is of the first consequence. Now, nothing connected with the worldly interests of society is of greater importance than a just appreciation of the rights of labor and property; inasmuch as these lie at the very foundation of the social system. In the main we are pleased with Dr. Lieber's views. He very justly considers that there is a right to property established in the necessity and nature of things—independent of and prior to human laws; or, in other words, that the moral purposes of God could not be answered without it. At the same time we could have wished that he had been more clear in some of his expositions—nor is his style by any means faultless. Still the work is well worthy of careful perusal; and we are pleased to see it in the Family Library.

---

11. *Narrative of an Expedition to the Polar Sea, in the Years 1820, '21, '22, and '23.* Commanded by Lieutenant, now Admiral FERDINAND WRANGELL. 18mo., pp. 302. Vol. 148 of Harpers' Family Library.

THIS appears to be the first published account of an expedition of a very remarkable character. Its object was to attempt to reach the north pole by means of sledges drawn by dogs over the ice. Four successive journeys were made for this purpose; and though they all failed of accomplishing the design for which they were undertaken, the history of these enterprises will be found exceedingly interesting. Much curious and valuable information is also given in relation to the dreary and inhospitable regions of Northern Siberia, and the various tribes which inhabit them. It appears that the Russians have various missionary stations among these barbarous and distant tribes, though from the accounts here given, we should think but little good could be expected from them.

---

12. *Parlor Melodies, comprising Music, original and selected, for the Piano-Forte and Organ, with several Tunes for the Harp and Guitar; adapted to a Series of original Songs, moral and religious.* Arranged and edited by Mrs. M. B. LLOYD, and Miss M. E. BAILEY. 4to., pp. 112. Harper & Brothers.

THE cultivation of music has become so general, that it is of great importance that the books designed to teach it should be as unexcep-



tionable as possible. This work has been got up for the purpose of correcting some striking defects in most previous collections, particularly in regard to the words. The ladies, for whose use it is especially intended, cannot but be gratified with the good taste evinced in the selections, and in their arrangement, and with the entire exclusion of those light and frivolous songs and vulgar sentiments so common in too many books of the kind, and so utterly at variance with the genuine feelings inspired by the concord of sweet sounds.

---

13. *Scandinavia, ancient and modern; being a History of Denmark, Sweden, and Norway: comprehending a Description of these Countries; an Account of the Mythology, Government, Laws, Manners, and Institutions of the early Inhabitants; and of the present State of Society, Religion, Literature, Arts, and Commerce; with Illustrations of their Natural History.* By ANDREW CRICHTON, LL. D., author of the "History of Arabia," &c., and HENRY WHEATON, LL. D., author of the "History of the Northmen," &c. Vols. 136 and 137 of Harpers' Family Library.

\* A CONDENSED and comprehensive history of the kingdoms of Northern Europe, presenting a clear and accurate account of the early character, superstitions, social and political institutions, wars, &c., of the Scandinavian nations, has been much wanted; and such is the work embraced in these volumes. Mr. Wheaton's residence at Copenhagen for several years as American minister afforded him unusual advantages for studying the antiquities, &c., of the Northmen; and of the fidelity with which he improved these advantages we have other evidence than that furnished by his contributions to this able and interesting work.

---

14. *Ruins of Ancient Cities, with general and particular Accounts of their Rise, Fall, and present Condition.* By CHARLES BUCKE. Harper & Brothers.

Few things speak so eloquently to the heart as the moldering remains of those proud monuments which man has vainly reared to perpetuate his fame. The author of this work has collected a vast number of highly interesting facts in relation to the most remarkable ancient ruins; and the Christian reader will find much in connection with many of the places here noticed, as Babylon, Nineveh, Tyre, Petra, (Edom,) Jerusalem, &c., exemplifying in the most surprising manner the truth of Scripture prophecy. These volumes are 134 and 135 of the Family Library.

15. *History of the Expedition to Russia, undertaken by the Emperor Napoleon in the Year 1812.* By Count PHILIP DE SEGUR. 2 vols., 18mo., pp. 662. Harper & Brothers.

HISTORY scarcely furnishes a parallel to this mighty expedition, and its disastrous termination was, perhaps, the most impressive rebuke ever given to unhallowed ambition. Long will the horrors of this frightful campaign be remembered, and it is hoped it will be a salutary lesson to restrain the nations from the madness and guilt of war. The narrative is powerfully written, and by one who was an actor in the scenes he describes. The work is accompanied by a map, and forms Nos. 141 and 142 of the Family Library.

---

16. *History of Michigan, from its earliest Colonization to the present Time.* By JAMES H. LAUMAN. 18mo., pp. 269. Harper & Brothers. Vol. 139 of the Family Library.

WE are glad to see the enterprising publishers of the Family Library adding to that valuable series well-written histories of the different states. The history of Michigan, embracing, as it does, a multitude of interesting circumstances connected with the early settlements of the French, their policy, their fur trade, &c., affords rich materials for the historian. Mr. Lauman has skillfully availed himself of these, and produced a very entertaining as well as useful work. The missionary operations of the Jesuits among the Indians, while the country was in the hands of the French, present a very striking picture, and some useful lessons.

---

17. *A System of Latin Prosody and Metre, from the best Authorities, ancient and modern.* By CHARLES ANTHON, LL. D. Harper and Brothers.

DR. ANTHON's editions of the Greek and Latin classics, and his different elementary and subsidiary works to facilitate their study, have, as every scholar knows, rare merit; and their republication abroad, and extensive introduction into the seminaries of Great Britain and Ireland, show that they are no less highly esteemed there than here. The object of the present work (a very important one in the series) is to supply the classical student with greater helps than he has hitherto been able to avail himself of, in regard to the true quantity and accent of Latin syllables, and the correct scanning of Latin verse—upon which the force, harmony, and beauty of the language, and, of course, the gratification of the reader, and a just appreciation of the author, so much depend. Like the works which have preceded it in the series, it is very fully supplied with critical annotations, to settle doubtful points, and correct existing errors.

18. *Travels in Europe and the East, embracing Observations made during a Tour through Great Britain, Ireland, France, Belgium, Holland, Prussia, Saxony, Bohemia, Austria, Bavaria, Switzerland, Lombardy, Tuscany, the Papal States, the Neapolitan Dominions, Malta, the Islands of Archipelago, Greece, Egypt, Asia Minor, Turkey, Moldavia, Wallachia, and Hungary.* By VALENTINE MOTT, M. D., President of the Medical Faculty of the University of New-York, and Professor of Surgery, &c., &c. 8vo., pp. 452. Harper & Brothers.

THIS work will doubtless excite no little curiosity, from the high standing of its author; and we regret that we have no more space to devote to it. But as our limits will not allow us to follow the learned professor in his extended course of travel, we must be content with a brief notice. Books of travels have so greatly multiplied of late years, and readers have been so often entertained with descriptions of the same things, that it has become a matter of no small difficulty to give to works of this kind sufficient novelty to render them generally interesting. Of this the writer was apprised; and he has very judiciously, we think, in the first part of his book, abstained from the more common and familiar topics, and devoted it almost exclusively to matters relating to his profession. Thus he introduces us to the most distinguished schools of medicine and surgery, and to a familiar acquaintance with the character, manners, &c., of the most eminent living medical and surgical writers and practitioners. In the less enlightened countries of the East, the author found, of course, but little of special interest connected with his profession. This part of the work, therefore, is of a different character, and consists principally of personal adventures, and of descriptions of the people of those countries, their antiquities, present condition, &c. If we are here presented with few things that are absolutely new, the writer evidently observed what came under his notice with a critical eye, and has given some *new and striking views*; particularly in regard to the Pythian oracle; the temple of Apollo at Delphos; and the religion of the ancient Egyptians. But we must say, upon the whole, the work does not come up to our expectations. The perpetual recurrence of *ego, ego*, and the general sterility of this work, certainly deserve criticism. It is got up in very handsome style, with beautiful type, paper, and binding, and will suit poor eyes much better than poor purses.

- 
19. *The Glory and the Shame of England.* By C. E. LESTER. In two vols., 8vo., pp. 253, 292. Harper & Brothers. 1841.

THE bold and romantic spirit of this work has already procured it no small share of attention both in this country and in Great Britain. The developments here made of the condition of the poor in England, making due allowance for the luxuriance of the author's fancy, are of a most fearful character. His predictions of a revolution will be tested by time. The work has its excellences, and we wish we could say it has no defects.

20. *The Mother's Assistant and Young Ladies' Friend.* WILLIAM C. BROWN editor. Vol. I., 8vo., pp. 283. Boston. 1841.

A copy of this excellent miscellany, neatly bound in muslin, has been politely forwarded to us by the editor, and is now upon our table. We have not space to exhibit its merits at length. We can say with confidence that it occupies a high rank among a class of publications altogether more important to the best interests of the age in which we live than any other whatever. We refer to works which have for their object the intellectual and moral improvement and refinement of the *female mind*.

The editor has secured several able contributors to his pages, and his selections are in good taste. The work is decidedly serious in its cast, and religious in its tendency. We heartily wish this good enterprise of our excellent friend, the editor, all the success that his enlarged benevolence can desire.

- 
21. *The Enquirer: devoted to free Discussion as to the kind of Wine proper to be used at the Lord's Supper, &c.*

THE first number of a new quarterly bearing the above title has recently appeared, in royal quarto. It is published at Albany, and contains fifteen letters from Edward C. Delavan, Esq., the editor and publisher, in vindication of his favorite project of banishing from the communion table all fermented wine. The "free discussion" is, therefore, all on one side, and it is but little more than a repetition of the plea for unfermented wine in the sacrament which was presented in the American Temperance Intelligencer in 1835. This paper was abandoned in consequence of the injurious effects of the discussion upon the cause of temperance. A correspondent of that paper, and a clergyman too, having been permitted by Mr. Delavan deliberately to propose the substitution of *water* in the communion, instead of "the fruit of the vine," which is the Scriptural element in this divinely appointed ordinance, nothing but the abandonment of the mischievous discussion could satisfy the Christian friends of temperance, and hence the paper and the discussion were given up. Indeed, many of the best friends of total abstinence belonging to the Christian ministry were constrained by their conscientious convictions of duty publicly to withdraw from the temperance societies, seeing that they were usurping the prerogatives of the Christian church.

Such having been the obvious mischiefs of the discussion at that time, the friends of temperance found it necessary to disclaim and repudiate all interference with the question of "wine at the sacrament," as a subject belonging exclusively to ecclesiastical discipline. Thus only were the friends of "total abstinence from all intoxicating drinks as a beverage" able to rally their forces, and prosecute their enterprise with any prospect of success.

That Mr. Delavan should now renew this fruitless and mischievous discussion, and thus jeopard the cause of temperance at this most interesting period of its history, is greatly to be lamented. That he should devote this periodical to this single topic, is a singular instance of the influence of the pride of opinion; at the shrine of which he seems prepared to sacrifice a cause, to the service of which he has consecrated many years of his life, and much of his fortune. It is true that he declares his opinion that the "cause of total abstinence from intoxicating drinks as a beverage is no longer in danger from an unpopular, or even a wrong movement by an individual member:" but though this may be true of some individual members, yet the position and relation so long held to the cause by himself, renders his course matter of painful apprehension. And though he "desires it expressly understood that it is as a Christian, and not as an officer of any association, that he makes his appeal; and that no temperance association is at all responsible for his errors," still this only proves that he is willing to forfeit his deservedly high position in the temperance ranks, if he can only carry out his crusade against fermented wine in the sacrament. To this he appears to have pledged "his life, his fortune, and his sacred honor."

That both duty and inclination should prompt those whose province it is to provide the elements for the Lord's table, to procure for the purpose pure wine, or the "fruit of the vine," in as great purity as possible, no one will deny. But that the use of fermented wine at the communion is a provocative to intemperance, or that it vitiates the ordinance when employed for the purpose, as Mr. Delavan would maintain, we hold



to be essentially preposterous. Moreover, we insist that if this question is to be mooted at all, it is a subject for the consideration of ecclesiastical bodies as such. Nor can such discussion as that of Mr. Delavan in the *Enquirer* be conducted without results to the temperance enterprise which every true friend to the cause must most heartily deprecate.

In the Appendix to this number of "the *Enquirer*," among sundry other documents, we find a number of articles, which merit unqualified approval, and our only regret is to find them stitched in the same cover with the letters on "wine at the sacrament," being wholly irrelevant. These are important testimonials from distinguished men, who are competent to judge, against the use of wine, and other intoxicating drinks *as a beverage*, and they possess neither identity nor congeniality with the subject to which the *Enquirer* is "devoted." The most valuable of these is the letter of Thomas Sewall, M. D., of Washington, on the pathology of drunkenness, illustrated by drawings of the human stomach. We concur with a contemporary editor in the opinion that the circulation of Dr. Sewall's letter and plates in a distinct form, separate from the "discussion of the communion question," with which they have nothing to do, would indeed supply a desideratum. And we are gratified to learn that this hint has been adopted, and that the letter, with the accompanying plates, has been issued, and may be obtained by the friends of temperance who will order it in this form from the publisher. We commend it, and especially the drawings, to the attention of the public, as worthy of their patronage. Let the rising generation look upon these graphic delineations of the mischiefs of alcoholic liquors, and they will be trained up with an instinctive horror of the drunkard's drink, which may fortify them against the ruinous snares of intemperance.

- 
22. *The Baptist Memorial and Monthly Chronicle*. Vol. I, No. 1. New-York, January, 1842. By an Association.

THE above number came to our office superscribed "Methodist Quarterly Register." Knowing there was no "Methodist Quarterly" published in New-York but ours, we tore off the envelop and commenced running over the pages. Finding a paragraph marked, we read it with no little interest, whereupon we found it to be part of a notice of Mr. Wycoff's discussion of the question between "the American Bible Society and the Baptists." In the marked paragraph we are told that the preface sets forth "the reasons which make such a publication in a permanent form desirable:" and "among them is that of correcting the misapprehensions and misrepresentations which prevail in regard to the origin and intentions of the American and Foreign Bible Society." And "among the periodicals which have been the most zealous in misrepresenting" the Baptists in relation to this matter, the writer has "the Methodist Quarterly Register."

Now if these gentlemen really know that *we* have misrepresented them, they certainly ought to know our *name*. Have our Baptist brethren read and refuted an article which appeared in our October number, signed F.? If so, they ought, at least, to know where they found it. And we hope we shall not offend them by suggesting that it would not have been an extraordinary instance of courtesy had they sent us a copy of the refutation. We must find the book at our earliest convenience, and avail ourselves of all its light. In the mean time, we hope should these good friends have any communications to make to us, they will please direct them to *The Methodist Quarterly Review*, 200 Mulberry-street.

- 
23. *Psychology; or, Elements of a new System of Mental Philosophy, on the Basis of Consciousness and Common Sense*. By S. S. SCHMUCKER, D. D.

24. *An Epitome of the History of Philosophy. Being the Work adopted by the University of France for Instruction in the Colleges, &c.* Translated from the French with additions. By C. S. HENRY, D. D.

THESE works possess sufficient interest to require a thorough examination, but not having the space necessary for this purpose, we must defer it until our next number.

☐ Several interesting pamphlets have been received which, we regret to say, we have no space to notice in this number.





Painted by J. Nims

Engraved by E. Modersitz

*of the New York Convention*

*Published by the Convention, New York, 1787*

